Selected Articles

Translated to English

from

Preußische Jahrbücher

(Prussian Yearbooks)

Volume 8.

by

R. Haym.

The Jews in the Christian West - Parts 1 & 2

The Negro Question and the Latest Events in America - Parts 1 && 3

Berlin, 1861.

Contents

Translators Notes 3
The Jews in the Christian West. 4
Part I. 4
Part II. 22
The Negro Question and the Latest Events in America. 48
Part I. 48
Part II. 62
Part III. 77

Translators Notes

The Prussian Yearbooks were a cultural-political monthly journal with a national-liberal character, published from 1858 to 1935.

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Preu%C3%9Fische_Jahrb%C3%BCcher

The early volumes did not credit the authors however Rudolf Haym was the editor of volumes 1-17.

These volumes were assembled from the magazines or booklets that were issued approximately monthly. Volume 8 (Thiel 8) is made up of six issues.

Rudolf Haym (1821 - 1901) was a philosopher and publicist.
Haym was one of the most important literary scholars of his time.

https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rudolf_Haym

The original German articles can be found here:

https://archive.org/details/preussische-jahrbucher-band-8-1861

Ian McGillivray

October 2025

The Jews in the Christian West.

Part I.

After the destruction of the Jewish state by Hadrian, the social condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire was still quite tolerable for some time. They were in full possession of civil rights; they had their patriarch at Tiberias, their ethnarchs (district chiefs), archisynagogues (synagogue chiefs) and synedries (synagogue councils) in an honoured position, and thus still exercised a certain autonomy among themselves. They were not even excluded from civil and military positions of honour, had access to the bar and practiced liberal arts. Even Theodosius I honoured the sayings of the Jewish authorities in their internal affairs.

With the rise of Christianity, however, things changed. Christianity is indeed the religion of love; but Christianity as a mass, as in its individual divisions, has far more often written repulsion, hatred and persecution on its banner against the foreign confessional creed than love and respect for one's neighbour. It is not as if Christianity were alone in this phenomenon: on the contrary, it shares with all other denominations this infirmity, which appears more conspicuous among them only because it is in flagrant contradiction to the supreme principle of their ethics.

It is in the very nature of the cooperative societies that the more perfectly each one closes in upon itself by an external or internal bond, by standard and form, by language and custom, by statute or symbol, the more exclusive it must become towards those outside; and it is equally natural that this exclusiveness cannot remain within itself, but leads to clashes and hostilities in the inevitability of outward intercourse. The history of Christianity, like that of Judaism and Islam, provides us with sad and bloody proof of this proposition: sadder than in the other two religions because, as I said, they run so completely against the spirit of the Gospel, and bloodier because none of the others has split into so many denominations and thus provided so much material for denominational and sectarian hatred. The Jews, too, have had to recognize the confessional spirit of the Christians as the first source of the fates and conditions they have had to endure in Christian countries down to more recent times; from this, in the Christian state, has arisen their inferior position in society, and from the latter, in turn, the moral degradation, doggedness and harmfulness to the community of which they have been accused in later times - and not without good reason. For centuries, the hatred between Jews and Christians sought its justification in reciprocity, and the turn for the better only took place when

the Enlightenment, which is now becoming the fashion to look down upon with noble contempt, broke the spike of confessionalism among Jews and Christians by opposing it with philosophical thought and the principle of humanity.

The Christians had first been hated and persecuted by the Jews, their religious founder had died as a victim of Jewish confessionalism, the first Christian communities were regarded by the Jews as an abomination of apostasy and blasphemy. So it is only too understandable that when Judaism fell and Christianity rose, the sword turned back. The temple in Jerusalem was broken, the people scattered to the four winds. This was regarded by the Christians as divine judgment to atone for the guilt inflicted on Christ. Prudentius already says:

Exiliis vagus huc illuc fluitantibus errat
Iudaeus, postquam patria de sede revulsus
Supplicium pro caede luit Christique negati
Sanguine respersus commissa piacula solvit.

(The Jew wanders among the exiles, drifting hither and thither, after being uprooted from his homeland, he suffered execution for the murder of the denied Christ, and, sprinkled with blood, he paid atonement for what he had he had committed.)

A new kind of original sin was passed on to all subsequent generations. Omnium Judaeorum fit culpa unius scelus, (The crime of one becomes the fault of all the Jews) - the Jews once said later to Alphonsus of Castile.

That the Christian priests did not lag behind in this view of the matter from time immemorial, but rather carried the banner forward, is a fact that cannot be ignored. Even St. Ambrose, who so courageously pricked the conscience of Theodosius the First when the imperial caprice maltreated a Christian city, and who even rebuked the first execution of heretics in the Roman Empire with moral indignation and at the risk of his life, found in his heart no word in favour of the Jews, but sharp speeches against them when Christians personally mistreated the Jews and when Theodosius had ordered a synagogue at Constantinople to be rebuilt at the expense of the guilty bishop, which had been plundered and burned on the bishop's orders. Under the banner of religion, an imperial rescript had said, all kinds of unauthorized things had been done. Ambrose went so far as to use almost threatening language against the emperor: Iustum est incendium synagogae impietatis; synagoga incensa est, perfidiae locus, impietatis domus, amentiae receptaculum, quod Deus damnavit ipse

(The burning of the synagogue of impiety is just; the synagogue was burned, a place of perfidy, a house of impiety, a receptacle of madness, which God himself condemned). If the synagogue in Milan were not already in ashes, he assured us, he himself would have it burned. This tone, in which other church fathers, such as Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria, who had the Jewish houses and synagogues plundered and destroyed, addressed Saint Ambrose, forms to a certain extent the theme for the variations of the following centuries. Although imperial decrees up to Valentinian III repeatedly protect the Jews against insults and abuse committed against persons and property under the pretext of the Christian religion, harsh strictures and far-reaching restrictions against the Jews are already in place. Not only is the patriarchy and the autonomy of the Jews in civil legal matters abolished, but the individual is also declared unfit for military service; the withdrawal of all religious practice and revocation of all previous concessions is threatened if the Jews allow an image of the holy cross to be burned in contempt of the Christian religion; the Jew who circumcises a Christian or has him circumcised is to be punished with confiscation of property and eternal banishment or even more severely. The spiritual approach becomes increasingly evident in the decrees of later emperors. A year of abuse is taken as divine punishment for the toleration shown to Jews, pagans and heretics; the resistance of the Jews is obduracy; no one is allowed to hold office in the state or in the community; no new synagogue may be built, only old ones may be supported; anyone who entices a Christian to apostasy is punished with confiscation of goods and eternal banishment or even more severely; Marriages between Christians and Jews are prohibited under the penalty of adultery. The Jew was not allowed to disinherit his child who had converted to Christianity, even if it had committed the grossest crimes against its father and mother; the child at least received the compulsory share, ut hoc saltem in honorem religionis electae meruisse videatur (so that this may at least seem to have earned the honour of the chosen religion.). The Jews are generally people without honour, they live in turpitudine fortunae, in qua et animam volunt esse (shameful fortune, which they also want to be their soul); as a witness a Jew can only appear in court against another Jew, not for him, and never against a Christian. This was the view of the late imperial period. It should be noted here that the Jews were hardly ever reproached by the Christian emperors for their civil behaviour; everywhere the religious point of view is prominent. -

After the fall of the Western Roman Empire, the Jews of the West lived almost everywhere without any specific legal status, according to the whim of the rulers of the moment. Sometimes forced to be baptized, or driven out of the country, as

under the Merovingian Dagobert, sometimes favoured, as under the Moors in Spain, whom they served all the better in the conquest of the country through local knowledge and scouting, because the Western Gothic law had treated them with fanatical barbarism since the introduction of Roman Catholicism, through their activities in the field of trade, for which their language and their connections with the Orient particularly qualified them, as well as through the favour of the great, to whom they knew how to make themselves useful, sometimes even indispensable, through manifold services, to replace what the law no longer gave them and what the clergy and the religious and national aversion of the peoples denied them. The Jew, deemed incapable of military service, passed from Roman rule to that of the Germanic peoples, remaining outside the feudal system that soon determined almost all landed property, and thus without any possibility of gaining a position in civil society. As a stranger among strangers, he was dependent on docility and mobility. He served the Muhammadans as a tax official, as an issuer of coins, as a collector of Christian taxes; the Christians as an interpreter, as a doctor, as an intermediary in diplomatic and commercial transactions. Jewish merchants paid the king a tenth of their profits; Charlemagne treated the Jews in the same way as he treated foreign merchants. When this emperor, perhaps in order to give the court of Byzantium something to do in the East in the interests of his Western plans, sent his well-known legation to Harun al Rashid, it was the Jew Isaac whom he entrusted with the actual commercial part of this mission. Accordingly, Charles also appears among the beneficiaries of the Jews. While he forbade them from keeping Christian slaves and insisted that they respect the degrees of kinship forbidden by Christians when concluding their marriages, he in no way restricted their main activity — trade. There were rich and respected Jews at that time; in Narbonne there was a Jewish head of the city next to the Christian one.

Louis the Pious, whose personal physician was the Jew Zedekiah, did even more. He protected the Jews in their property ownership, exempted them from various taxes, allowed them to take on Christian servants and even to trade in slaves within the empire. The early importance of the Jews in trade is evidenced by the fact that even then markets were moved from Saturday to other days because of them. This also had an effect on other circumstances. In Lyon, where Jewish trade was at a high level, wealthy Jews mixed socially with Christians, religious differences became blunter, and Christians sometimes even attended Jewish sermons more diligently than the church. Archbishop Agobard became fearful of apostasy because, as he himself complained, the belief that the Jews had a better religion and were more pious than the Christians was spreading rapidly and was even represented at court.

He issued various episcopal decrees aimed at removing the Christians from social and commercial intercourse with the "viper's breed", which blasphemed the Son of God daily and cursed the Christians. But on the complaint of the Jews, his decrees were declared ineffective. Agobard even had the pain of hearing even the imperial commissioners express the strange view for that time that there were indeed Jews who were better at deceiving than some Christians. His pamphlet De superstitionibus Iudaeorum, written on this occasion to justify himself, repeated the accusations of earlier bishops and added new ones; but the Jews were far too firm with the emperor for him to have been able to get through. It is even doubtful whether he was able to obtain the desired surrender of pagan Jewish slaves who presented themselves for baptism in exchange for the payment of the purchase price.

After Louis's death, however, the clerical influence became more powerful again. Clergymen appeared in the synagogue on the Sabbath to preach sermons on conversion; a council in Meaux renewed the old regulations by which Jews were forbidden to act as lawyers, administrators, judges and warriors, to keep Christian slaves, to build synagogues and to marry Christian women. The insulting custom that the head of the Jewish community in Toulouse had to receive a slap in the face in front of the cathedral portal every Easter, Whitsun and Christmas also dates from that time. The good times of Charles and Louis were soon over for the Jews.

Factual phenomena, which have acquired a certain stability through age and persistence, tend, however much they may contradict the purified idea of law, to gradually come under the influence of a kind of theoretical view of law. According to the theory, the Jews should actually be expelled as enemies of Christ and Christians according to the ordinary law; but if they are tolerated in the country, this is done out of pure grace and mercy (pro sola humanitate, as Pope Alexander III, or ex mera gratia et misericordia, as Clement III says); as a matter of grace, their admission and toleration is therefore a regal matter, in Germany of the emperor, in France of the king, who can therefore terminate their grace again according to circumstances and discretion. However, since in France the Capetians still had to fight long battles for their regalia with the greats of the empire, it is not surprising that we see the larger and even the smaller vassals dealing with their Jewish affairs in a fairly independent manner. In Germany, the emperors, as patrons of the Jews, first granted the right to admit Jews as a lucrative favour to individual ecclesiastical and secular vassals, such as Otto I to the Archbishop of Magdeburg, Otto II to the Bishop of Merseburg, Frederick I to the Dukes of Desterreich, and Otto IV to the Archbishop of Mainz. This was also sometimes associated with the new right of protection. Even under Rudolph

of Habsburg, the abbess of Quedlinburg exercised protection (protectio et tutela) over the Jews there. The admission permits became increasingly widespread. Albrecht I granted them to the Wildgrave [1]) of Dhaun, Louis the Bavarian to the towns of Wimpfen, Erfurt and Worms, as well as to the Schenken von Schweinsberg; even before that, Jews could be found in the territories of Meissen, Thuringia and in other countries. It is therefore a mistake to assume that it was only the Golden Bull that transferred the original imperial right to admit Jews to Andre, and exclusively to the electors. The Golden Bull [2]), which does not contain entirely new provisions, grants the right in question to the electors, but also confirms the rights of those who have already acquired it through privilege or enfeoffment. This state of affairs did not last long, however. In the development of sovereign power, practice and customary law were again far ahead of legislation, and one may well assume that the right to admit and protect Jews had long been generally regarded as an attribute of sovereignty and had been in use when the reformed imperial police regulations of 1548 and 1577 expressly recognized that right for the imperial estates down to the immediate imperial knighthood.

---

1) "Wildgrave" is an alternative spelling for Waldgrave, a historical German noble who held office related to forest management or hunting in the Holy Roman Empire.

2) The Golden Bull of 1356 was a decree issued by the Imperial Diet at Nuremberg and Metz headed by the Emperor Charles IV which fixed, for a period of more than four hundred years, important aspects of the constitutional structure of the Holy Roman Empire.

The emperor's relationship of patronage [1]) naturally had to change as a result of these changes. Even Wenceslas of Bohemia had to deal with almost no other Jews than those of the imperial estates; however, the name still remained, and although Charles VI and Charles VII had also obtained the so-called coronation gold only from the Jews of the imperial estates and the imperial knighthood, the jurists of the eighteenth century still vindicated the supreme right of protection to the emperor in general. In contrast, the legal question of admission and protection between the sovereigns and their landed estates was the subject of much debate in the last few centuries. It was disputed whether the right in question was an inseparable or a transferable sovereign right, whether the sovereign could expel the Jews of his landed gentry once they had been admitted, whether the landed gentry could allow his Jews to build synagogues on their own authority, etc. In general, however, it was considered established that the landowner entitled to admit Jews was never to exercise protection and therefore was not to carry out an intended admission until

the sovereign's letter of protection had been obtained. As a rule, the sovereign shared the protection money with the landowner, who could also demand special services from the person admitted. The Hesse-Darmstadt government and the Hessian nobility clashed several times in the last century. The Wolfe von Gudensberg family at Höringhausen, the Schenken zu Schweinsberg family in Kestrich and the Vierer von Buseck family in Beuern had approved the construction of synagogues. In the second of these cases, military execution was even threatened, and in the third, the entire Hessian knighthood took up the cause of the Lords of Buseck at a Diet in Butzbach, with one part claiming unimaginable ownership and another part asserting that the right of exception also included the power to grant synagogue permission, which the government denied as contrary to the sovereignty of the Landgrave.

---

1) Schutzherrlichkeitsverhältniß - “rights by protection of nobility”.

Incidentally, the legal conception of the Middle Ages not only regarded the Jews as the pupils of their patrons, but also placed them in a relationship of absolute servitude to them. Their own guilt condemned them to this forever. "Propria culpa eos submisit perpetuae servituti;" - says Clemens III. "Imperialis auctoritas a priscis temporibus ad perpetuam iudaici sceleris ultionem eisdem Iudaeis perpetuam indixit servitutem," says even the more enlightened Frederick II. The same emperor calls them "servi camerae nostrae speciales," a designation that also persists in the following times. Incidentally, one should not, as is often the case, look for such designations of the Jews only from the words of emperors. Even the Landgraves of Thuringia and Margraves of Meissen promised in a document of 1368 to protect and shield the Jews "as our chamber servants," and even as early as 1278 the Jews in Bavaria were the "chamber servants" of the duke.

These derogatory names stand in stark contrast to the fact that Jews were still listed as Roman citizens throughout almost the entire Middle Ages; even in Schweinsberg, they are referred to as such. In some places, they are simply called citizens. But we must not take the name of servitude quite as literally as that of Roman or any other civilization. There was a fine line between the two, which, depending on the circumstances, sometimes approached the extremes on the right, sometimes on the left. It is true that in Germany, as in France and England, the idea of servitude seemed to be taken quite strictly at times. Louis IX, or rather the regent Blanca, treated the Jews entirely as belonging to the king or the vassals by decreeing

that every lord, wherever he came across his Jew, was allowed to capture him as his own servant, however long he might have lived on foreign territory. Around the same time, the rich Jew Benjamin was given to the daughter of the sub-grave of Beziers as part of the dowry, and a little later Edward I of England gave the Jew Aaron to his brother Edmund. Emperor Charles IV cancelled all the Burgrave of Nuremberg's Jewish debts and guarantees with the following justification: "we may do so by our royal power and authority, and all Jews, with their bodies and possessions, belong to our chamber and are under our power and control, so that we may do with them as we please." He also sold the Jews of Frankfurt with all movable and immovable property to this city, just as his ancestors had already pledged a part of it to Mainz, which the council of Frankfurt now bought in addition. King Wenceslas took the liberty of disposing of the interest and capital of the Jews in Bohemia and Moravia. But the Jews who were sold, pledged, or given as fiefs merely transferred to a new relationship of servitude to another lord; they retained their family rights, their right to make wills, and, as a rule, their property, and their servitude consisted essentially of monetary payments, the pressure of which had often been harsh enough since Charles IV. We will talk about this later.

However, the Jews were no more citizens in the sense of the word than they were slaves, however often they were referred to as such. Louis the Bavarian had allowed the towns of Wimpfen and Erfurt to admit Jews under this name, and in Stendal the Jews were even called citizens of the town; but their lot was no better in these places than elsewhere. Neither names nor promises mattered to the arbitrariness of the rulers. In Würtemberg, for example, a free treaty with the count in 1431 stipulated that the Jews would be accepted as citizens; however, in the case of a Jewish family that moved to Cannstadt in 1471, we find that they were accepted with the rights and freedoms "of the other poor people and serfs." The Jews still further admitted to the purchased ones by the council of Frankfurt with Charles' permission were indeed called "citizens of the realm and of our lords;" however, if a Jew from Frankfurt subsequently had the audacity to adopt the civic name, he would pay for his transgression with a fine of three gold guilders; "resident and member of the council", also known as "civis Romanus" in chamber style, was the only permissible designation for him.

The German protected Jew had to navigate between semi-slavery and meaningless citizenship in order to gain and maintain his existence, hardly any happier than his fellow believers in France, who were constantly fluctuating between excessive favouritism from above and equally unrestrained mistreatment. Imperial

protection proved insufficient enough in cases of persecution; the protection of the territorial lords had almost the sole effect of granting Jews the right to sue debtors and offenders in their territories.

Always uncertain as to how long the toleration would last in a particular place, the Jew had to be ready to leave at any time in both countries; even if he had not been forbidden to own land everywhere, for this reason alone he was advised to acquire movable property instead of real estate. So they turned to trade, which sank into haggling and dallying among the poorer people, but created capital among the more fortunate, which led to the usury of money on a large scale. Banks and pawnshops, apart from those of the Italian Caorsini, were mainly undertaken by Jews. German law curiously favoured the pawnbroking of the Jews in that, contrary to the general provisions, even if they had accepted stolen goods, it dispensed them from the proof of their guarantor as long as they proved that they had not accepted the pawn secretly, but "on a fine day and in front of their door in the open street"; they then only had to return it to the real owner against payment of the money lent. "Now they have bought preferential rights, - says the Swabian newspaper, the kings have given it wrongfully, that they may lend on thieving and on robbery." Loan transactions became very widespread. In the twelfth century, half of Paris is said to have been pledged to the Jews. Bishops and abbots addicted to pleasure pledged even precious crucifixes, monstrances, chalices and gospel books rich in gold and precious stones to them in return for loans that were not in proportion, which were then rarely redeemed, but were used elsewhere by the Jews at great profit. The fact that bishops must have simply sold the silverware of their churches early on is evident from a capitular of Charlemagne, which forbids them to do so. In addition, Jews were also mint overseers, tax officials, agents and confidants of the great, and some were even allowed to call themselves chamber counts in this capacity. However, it should not go unmentioned that in 1182 the Jews also ran 42 cloth-making and tanning workshops in Paris.

Depending on their personal and local circumstances, some of the Jews were thus engaged in a meagre livelihood, while others achieved considerable wealth: but neither the one nor the other became popular. Haggling led to trickery and perfidy, usury to harshness and oppression, wealth provoked envy and greed. A national and religious veneer provided their enemies with the means to whitewash common impulses. The man who had been rejected by God, the blasphemer of the Gospel, the tolerated and proliferating stranger should be richer and happier than the native, the Christian? One of the first crusaders' vanguards was the Jews on the Rhine; the

enemies of Christ were closer, more convenient and better prey here than in the distant Orient. In Mainz alone, over a thousand Jews were killed; part of the spoils went into the archbishop's coffers, and he subsequently sought to defend the persecutors against the emperor. At Speier, the bishop took care of the persecuted for money; the protection invoked by the emperor, however, was limited to allowing those forced to be baptized by fear to return to Judaism. A new, almost even more ferocious persecution broke out during the second crusade. Many had fallen before Conrad III could intervene. St. Bernard's sermon was also of little effect here, when he said that many Christians were even worse usurers than the Jews (Taceo, quod sicubi (Iudaei) desunt, pejus iudaizare dolemus Christianos foeneratores, si tamen Christianos et non magis baptizatos Iudaeos convenit appellare). He probably meant the Italians. It is a fact that a few centuries later in Florence, in order to control only Christian usury, the Jews were summoned to the city on condition that they were only allowed to take 25 percent. Bernard was as little heard in this as in his zeal against the secularization of the hierarchy. Adventurous stories spread about captured Christian children who were slaughtered by the Jews on Good Friday to celebrate the Passover. New fables were added that Jews, to the shame of Christianity, would stab through consecrated wafers which then began to bleed. As crude as such inventions were, even declared by Clement VI to be embellishments of rapacity, they nevertheless had their effect at the time, and even in recent times they have been presented to the Jews as truth by opponents of emancipation.

Philip Augustus of France wrote off all Jewish debts, in which the royal treasury also made a profit, and also took from the Jews of his crown lands their farms and houses and then expelled them. When the war with England had emptied his coffers, he took back the expellees for money and allowed them to charge his subjects interest of up to two deniers of the livre per week, which amounted to 43 per cent for the year; however, a debt claim was not to be valid for more than one year. Under Louis IX, who also wrote off a third of Jewish debts, and under Philip III and Philip IV, all interest was again prohibited; but Philip the Fair also forbade the Inquisition to take action against Jews for usury. Usury now rose again to an enormous level, and when the Jews were rich enough, the king took their money and expelled them. The Jews were, to use the expression of a recent writer, like sponges that are soaked up and then squeezed out again. Louis X recalled the expellees against the payment of 122,500 livres and the surrender of two-thirds of their outstanding claims, in order, as he said, to effect their conversion the more easily; he allowed them in return the former rate of interest, as it had been under Philip Augustus. After being expelled again and yet soon having their letters of

protection renewed for another twenty years, they were once more the victims of financial speculation under the insane Charles VI, who expelled them from the country for ever and declared them to have lost all their property. During their last stay, they had even been allowed to take 86% of their property.

When Innocent III said that the Jew was mus in pera, serpens in gremio, ignis in sinu (a mouse in a bag, a snake in a lap, a fire in a bosom), - the great men of the West knew everywhere what they had in the Jews in a financial respect, and therein certainly lies to a great extent the reason for their toleration and even their protection against the rapacity of the mob, who were not able to appropriate for themselves what the lord himself could directly or indirectly benefit from. This was also known outside France.

The fourteenth century was again characterized by the persecution of the Jews. First the Jews were said to have incited the outlaws to a conspiracy to poison the wells; the pyres smoked everywhere, and the Jews of Paris were also sentenced to a fine of 150,000 livres. Around the middle of the century, general slaughter followed, almost in all the countries of Germany. The great plague raged, which the Jews were said to have caused by poisoning wells. In Strasbourg, under the aegis of the bishop and the Swabian nobility, 2000 unfortunate people were burned to death on a wooden scaffold, in Mainz even more, in Basel and Freiburg there were also murders; in Worms, Erfurt, Frankfurt and Oppenheim the desperate people locked themselves in their houses and burned themselves with their families and their possessions. Plundering and division was everywhere, even if the goal was not achieved everywhere. Part of Strasbourg Cathedral and part of the walls of Basel were built from looted Jewish property. In Strasbourg, the mob seceded from the resisting council; the master craftsman who had spoken in favour of protecting the Jews was punished with confiscation of his property. Emperor Charles IV tried to intervene against such atrocities, but for what reason? In his letter to the people of Strasbourg, he emphasized "to the great detriment of our citizens." In 1382 the people of Nördlingen beat all their Jews to death (200 people) and took all their possessions; two years later the Augsburgers captured their own and extorted 22,000 guilders from them. The Archbishop of Magdeburg had previously dealt with his Jews in a similar way when he wanted to raise his pallium fees; he had taken 100,000 marks and all uncoined gold and silver from them. Such extortions were repeated throughout the century, and in the early fifteenth century the princes of Thuringia and Meissen followed suit. The suppression of Jewish debts was no longer unknown in Germany either. Henry VII, Louis the Bavarian and Charles IV had

practiced it, but Wenceslas did it most magnificently. He did it, for example, for the bishops of Augsburg, Würzburg and Bamberg, for the. citizens of Nuremberg and for other cities and sovereigns. But Bavaria paid him 15,000 gulden, the Count of Dettingen the same amount, Nuremberg 400, Rothenburg 1000 gulden, sums that were raised by the individual citizens and subjects. And the example of Mainz proves that even sworn oaths were disregarded in such cases. In 1335, Archbishop Heinrich released the citizens there "in the name of the Lord" from the oaths they had sworn to their Jewish creditors in Worms, Speier, Strasbourg and Basel. The natural consequence of this debt release was none other than the insecurity of all loans; and this in turn necessarily entailed an increase in interest. The Jews always remained indispensable to the princes in monetary transactions.

While the princes acted arbitrarily or according to need, the clergy on the whole adhered to their former views, but in the main were able to change little, and in many cases even knew how to take advantage of the existing practice. In conciliar documents and papal decrees, the old clerical regulations were often repeated, which amounted to segregation, degradation and conversion: Christians should not be servants of Jews, at least not on Sundays, should not dine with them, Christian women should not suckle Jewish children, Jews should wear a special badge on their clothes, avoid Christian baths and taverns, not appear in public in the second half of the charity week, not be doctors, not act as witnesses against Christians, not take interest, build their synagogues only up to a certain height. However, these regulations were sometimes not followed at all, sometimes only in isolated areas and temporarily. Sexual intercourse between Christians and Jews was considered a serious offense. The Vienna Council of 1267 imposed a fine of 10 marks of silver. A Mainz law is more barbaric, but at the same time it also takes the sting out of the offense by allowing the Jew threatened with mutilation to be bought off for a sum to be agreed. In other places, the two guilty parties were even to be burned to death in such cases, because - it was said - "the Christian had denied the Christian faith." The canon law prohibited the taking of interest at all times, and this prohibition has not been revoked to this day. The Inquisition thus persecuted the "usuraria pravitas" (usurious perversity); but bishops and monasteries took loans from Jews, who were condemned as "public usurers," boldly and unhesitatingly, and ecclesiastical princes offered the exiled a refuge for money. When reference is made to the protection that some popes are said to have afforded the Jews, this refers mainly to the persecutions by the mob, and Christian charity had little part in this. Gregory IX, however, gave the Jews remarkable privileges, but only for large sums; they were allowed to collect money and even keep Christian servants and wet nurses. John XXII of Avignon, who

turned everything into a source of money, countered his persecutory sister with humane words, but the leniency he exercised was also paid for. Although Clement VI persecuted the German emperor and the ascetic and ascetic-strict fratricelles [1]) who wanted to hold him to the vow of poverty, he protected his Jews in the great persecution - non sine suspicione pecuniarum (not without suspicion of greed), says Trithemius. His disciple and pupil Charles IV may have learned from him what the Jews were worth. Alexander VI, the infamous Borgia, also took money when he took in 15,000 Jews whom Ferdinand the Catholic had expelled. The ghetto in Rome was a filthy but lucrative sanctuary.

---

1) The Fraticelli (Italian for "Little Brethren") or Spiritual Franciscans opposed changes to the rule of Saint Francis of Assisi, especially with regard to poverty, and regarded the wealth of the Catholic Church as scandalous. The Fraticelli were declared heretical in 1296 by Boniface VIII.

Is it any wonder that under such circumstances the moral character of the Jews grew worse and worse, when, with the almost complete impossibility of other means of livelihood, they sank into commerce, criminality and usury, when they became cunning, dishonest, crafty and treacherous? when, with the uncertainty of the future, they exploited the favour of the moment to the fullest extent, when baseness arose from fear and the desire for gain, when hatred and vengeance against the oppressors boiled in their hearts, and when, nevertheless, the villainy and treachery of the poorer Jews against the rich Jews again became an ally of the oppressors? Rejected and mistreated by a state society in or alongside which they could nevertheless feel themselves to be an indispensable element, the Jews were even forced to feel contempt for a confession whose followers so often denied the mildness of their religious principles through injustice and violence, yet were so willing to soften the rigorism of their exclusive principles for the sake of money. We therefore believe, and take the liberty of contradicting certain apologists in this regard, that in those times the Jews may well have meant Christians very fervently when they cursed Edomites and Gentiles in their prayers; we would find it almost unnatural if this had not been the case. We therefore believe, and take the liberty of opposing certain apologists in this, that the Jews in those times may often enough have meant the Christians very fervently when they cursed Ebomites and Goyim in their prayers; we would have to find it almost unnatural if it had not been so. After all, the pope curses all Christian heretics every year in a solemn act, and the Protestants also prayed against the pope and the Turks and mutually condemned

their own various confessions. It goes without saying that the Jews as such could not be favourable to Christian dogma. It is not at all unbelievable that among themselves they mocked and insulted the teachings and objects of Christian worship, pierced hosts, albeit without the miracle of blood, and dishonoured and melted down crucifixes that had fallen to them as pledges. Even the reports of Christian murders, apart from the perfidious fable of the slaughter of children on Good Friday, are not necessarily all lies. But what was really factual in all this was partly explainable from the point of view of the Jew, to whom the Christian view was alien, and outweighed by reciprocity, partly caused by Christian insults, partly, as a deed of the individual, in any case only subject to the forum of the judge by law, who had to punish the guilty party solely and exclusively. But in this latter respect, too, it was as that Spanish Jew once said: Nos Judaei sicut mures sumus, quorum unus si caseum furtim depastus sit, in omnes culpa confertur: ita omnium Iudaeorum fit culpa unius scelus (We Jews are like mice, if one of them has stolen the cheese, the blame is attributed to all of them: thus the crime of one becomes the fault of all the Jews). The alleged or actual killing of a noble boy at Weißensee in 1303 resulted in the slaughter of Jews throughout Thuringia. There was a certain solidarity of misery among the Jews, and the pressure exerted on them from outside may have contributed far more to a closer union and to the preservation of their physical and spiritual physiognomy than their religious cohesiveness or their national Messiah hopes. The gradual amalgamation with the Christian peoples was impossible simply because of the attitude of these lecterns, who did not permit a connubium anywhere, and even conversions were made more difficult by the fact that in some places, and even in Rome, the new converts were strangely required to hand over to the Church all the property they had acquired in Judaism. What they experienced on both sides nourished and fostered mutual hatred, which even sought to give itself a religious consecration, while it contradicted not only the Christian principle, but also the purer ideas of Mosaism. In the Talmud and in the later rabbinical writings, even after the explanations which educated and unprejudiced Jews have given us about the content and validity of those writings, and according to which so many accusations otherwise made collapse into nothing, there still remains much from which Christian hatred and wickedness could derive an authorization, however little the advanced Jews of the present may consider themselves bound to such teachings. The historical question is a different one from the cultural-philosophical one. It is a fact, however, which even the enlightened and fair-minded historian of the Israelites, F. M. Joft, recognizes, that the Jews of the Middle Ages, especially in Germany and northern France, and most of all in Poland, fell into deep moral decay. The Spanish Jews, who

lived in better conditions under the Moors and even under Christian kings, enjoyed prosperity and education, and looked down on their brothers in central Europe with contempt, were more successful. But even the Spanish Jews did not refrain from trade and usury. King Jacob of Aragon lowered the interest rate to 20 percent in 1228. The Jews in some areas of southern France also enjoyed a more favourable position at times. . In the thirteenth century, Toulouse offered the remarkable phenomenon of even mentioning a Jew among its consuls.

From the middle of the fifteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth century there was almost not a single region of note in Germany that had not expelled its Jews and then taken them in again; in some of them this was even repeatedly the case. It was the same here as in Misitra, of whose Jews a traveling Frenchman says: Tout le monde s'en plaint, et personne ne peut s'en passer (everyone complains about them, and no one can get by without them). Even today, the German farmer would be missing something if he did not have the Jews as intermediaries for his cattle trade.

Even the Reformation had no immediate favourable influence on the fate of the Jews. The time had not yet come when the truth was recognized that different denominations could exist side by side in the state with equal civil rights; the Protestant countries of the empire still had to fight for their legal existence for several ages, and in the individual Catholic and Protestant states the principle of the ruling religion still applied for two centuries, and still applies in part even against Christians. Christian orthodoxy was everywhere the norm for the assessment of civil rights; but orthodoxy was understood differently by each denomination, and the Jews naturally fell nowhere under this concept. Toleration was therefore the most favourable thing that could be hoped for them, even among Protestants. But a time of religious struggles is not in itself favourable to toleration; In addition, the revived study of Hebrew focused attention on the Talmudic and rabbinical writings, many of which had recently appeared in print and which had to be combated dogmatically, and the revelations of Jewish proselytes about the teachings and lives of the Jews, which were not doubted at the time, also cast a light on this people in the first decade of the Reformation, in which they appeared to be a sacrilegious and harmful pack of religious abusers and enemies of Christians. Conversion was therefore the watchword of the reformers, expulsion of the obstinate, at most toleration under the most extreme restrictions.

Luther spoke mildly and moderately at the beginning. "They have," he said, "dealt with the Jews as if they were dogs and not men, have done no more than scold them and take their goods when they have been punished; no Christian teaching or life has been shown to them. - If we deal kindly with Jews and instruct them carefully from the Scriptures, many of them will become true Christians. - I believe that if the Jews listened to our sermons, as we do to the sayings in the Old Testament, they would gain much. Disputing only makes them angrier and more stubborn."

Soon, however, when the revelations of converted Jews about the blasphemies and merciless usury of their former co-religionists had become known through print, Luther spoke in a completely different tone. He advised the princes "that the synagogues and schools of the Jews should be set on fire, and what will not burn should be heaped up and covered with earth, so that no man shall see a stone or cinder of it for ever. And this should be done in honour of our Lord and Christendom, so that God may see that we Christians see and have not knowingly tolerated nor approved such public lying, cursing and blaspheming of his Son and his Christians. For what we have hitherto tolerated out of ignorance (I did not know it myself), God will forgive us." Luther then goes on to make the most bitter invectives against the Jews, sometimes advocating their complete expulsion, sometimes at least the strictest surveillance and coercive measures for a hard-working life. He wants "the young, strong Jews and Jewesses to be given flails, axes, rakes, spades, distaffs, and spindles, and to be allowed to earn their bread by the sweat of their brows, as Adam's children are supposed to do. For it is of no avail that they should leave us cursed Goyim sweating, and they, the holy people, should take it easy with holy days, feasts and pomp, and blasphemously boast that they are masters of the Christians by our sweat, but the lazy dog attitude should be driven out of their nature. The Jews are a desperate, thoroughly evil, thoroughly poisoned, thoroughly devilish thing, for they have been our plague, pestilence, and all misfortune for 1,400 years and still are. In short, they are true devils, there is no other way to describe them; they have no human heart toward us Gentiles. They learn this from their rabbis in the devil's nests of their schools."

Among Luther's words, it was usually the strictest and most exclusive ones that the theologians who called themselves after his name clung to most tenaciously until recent times. This was particularly evident in the Jewish question, where they almost universally adhered to the clerical view of the Middle Ages. In addition to the theological reasons against the toleration or freer status of the Jewish population, they now also used state police arguments, just as the learned jurists also used

theological arguments to justify their theory of exclusion. For a long time, a certain solidarity of action developed between the two parties, against which almost only the governments, sometimes out of self-interest, sometimes out of better insight and out of a sense of justice, were able to counteract with their power rulings. For among princes and officials since then there have been only few who, unconcerned about everything else, just for the sake of consistency could say forever with Christoph of Würtemberg: "Even f these accursed people want to give me plenty of money, I would still not suffer them in my principality, because they have become unfaithful to my brother and Savior Jesus Christ and are public sorcerers." A dispute of principles about keeping away or tolerating also dragged on for a long time between Protestant governments and their theologians. When Philip the Magnanimous said “that some Jews had done more kindness and goodness to their subjects with loans and advances and had earned less usury than the Christians, and he had found nowhere in the Scriptures that they should be expelled completely”, his theologians replied: " Because true religion can only desire unity, where someone among a people is permitted to publicly practice another religion and abandon the true religion, this must surely amount to some violation of the true religion. Where a false religion is tolerated and not punished, things may indeed turn out badly." When the landgrave and his successors nevertheless tolerated the Jews, the theologians again complained that the conditions under which this toleration was granted were not observed by the corrupt officials. "Qui dat pecuniam summis, der ma chet wohl strack, was krumm ist (He who gives money in abundance, makes what is crooked well straight)," - says the superintendent Georg Nigrinus [1]) in his "Jüdenfeind (Enemy Jew)." "That is," he continues, "the cause of all the misery, to which the common man is subjected, that they are so masterful in currying favour with the authorities, bending and bowing, even lying and deceiving, so that they often have better access and standing with them compared to the poor Christian subjects." The anti-Jewish statements of the zealous Nigrinus, who was basically in favour of expulsion and wanted to see toleration permitted only out of mercy and under the harshest restrictions, was countered by Landgrave William IV from such a free standpoint of religious and statesmanlike insight as few princes in his century have achieved. "If such arguments as those put forward by Nigrinus were to be valid, he said, then no other religious affinities outside the religion to which the authorities belong would have to be tolerated, but the Papists, Calvinists and all other sects would have to be expelled, against which the Lord God has given no prohibition at all, but wishes to maintain a common law and peaceful life among all, regardless of which religion they

want ..... And thus the papists would have a good excuse not to suffer any other religion in their countries than the papist one, which they consider to be true."

---

1) Pastor Georg Nigrinus (1530-1602), Evangelical theologian and satirist. Nigrinus is a Latinization of the German surname Schwartze.

Even if in quite a few countries the theological views prevailed at times to the point of keeping the Jews out altogether, a compromise was soon reached almost everywhere between Zealotry and the governments, which placed toleration under the guarantee of the so-called Jewish ordinances.

The Jews in the Christian West.

Part II.

The presentation of our subject matter in the previous issue led up to the enactment of the Jewish Codes. These regulations, which often differ greatly from one another in detail, can be traced back to the following main points of view. They are, first, those which have for their object the honour of God and Christianity; secondly, those which have for their object the interest of the patron, and thirdly, those which have for their object the protection of civil society against the disadvantages to be apprehended from the Jews.

As far as the first point is concerned, it goes without saying that any blasphemy or insult of what the Christians held sacred as a point of doctrine or object of worship was strictly forbidden everywhere. This was accompanied by police supervision not only of Jewish religious books, but in some places also of Jewish worship. According to Philip the Magnanimous' decree, Jewish books were to be inspected by the parish priests and, if anything contrary to the Christian faith was found in them, they were to be burned immediately by the officials. If the priest did not understand Hebrew, the books were to be sent to Marburg. The Tridentine Council censored the Talmud from the same point of view. The learned Hebraist Christoph Helvicus from Giesen was requested by the Frankfurt council from the Landgrave when the Jewish books were to be examined after the Fettmilch uprising [1]). In Prussia, a royal commissioner attended the services in the synagogues to ensure that Christ was not blasphemed as Gone in the prayer "Alenu Leschabeach" and despised by spitting, as some baptized Jews had testified.

---

1) The Fettmilch uprising of 1614 was a revolt in Frankfurt led by baker Vincenz Fettmilch. It culminated in the pillaging of the Jewish quarter and the expulsion of Frankfurt's Jewish population. In 1616, Fettmilch and six others were executed on Frankfurt's Rossmarkt (horse-market) square.

The Jews were forbidden to discuss religious matters in front of unlearned people. Scholars, on the other hand, were supposed to engage in public disputations against them. Helvicus was particularly strong on this point. Under his chairmanship, Colestin Mislenta from Königsberg once held Hebraic disputations against the Jews in Giesen, and learned rabbis came from Frankfurt to oppose him. Conversion sermons had already been ordered by Philip the Great. Such orders can also be

found in other countries, sometimes with a fine of one thaler for each omission. In Rome, under Gregory XIII, a Dominican had to preach weekly in a church near the ghetto to certain groups of Jews. The success was insignificant. Sirens walked around the church, paying those present and beating the inattentive who plugged their ears, deliberately coughed or otherwise made a noise, with sticks on their heads and backs, so that often great commotion arose and the preacher had to stop. Rich people sent paid deputies. After a long break, Amalie Elisabeth again appointed two special preachers in Hesse-Kassel, whose sermons the Jews were to listen to at least twice a quarter. A volume of such Jewish sermons by Justus Soldan on Christ as Messiah appeared in print. This was also connected with the editing of a Jewish catechism on the messianic passages of the Old Testament. However, at their request, the Jews were exempted from memorizing the catechism, but were to "take it to themselves and read it." Almost simultaneously, George II also ordered Jewish sermons for Hesse-Darmstadt at Giesen, Alsfeld and elsewhere; but although the learned Peter Haberkorn himself did his best at Giesen, the wicked people did not show the slightest attention, as an eyewitness assures us.

Among the measures aimed at elevating Christianity was the fact that, in most cases, as was particularly the case in both Hesse regions, Jewish religious exercises could not be held in large synagogues, but only in remote locations , which were usually called schools, and that in complete silence and with closed doors; furthermore, that in towns where there were Jewish streets, the Jews were locked away on Christian holidays, and that the service of Christian Shabbat maids was also tied to a certain limit.

Sexual relations with Christians remained punishable by death for some time, but in Hesse-Darmstadt the punishment was to be carried out only with the prior knowledge of the regent. With the progressive softening of views on such offenses in general, the jurists later reduced the punishment to corporal punishment, and probably also to fines. In criminal punishments, however, the Jew as a whole retained an unfortunate disadvantage over the Christian criminal for a long time. In 1637, during the coronation of Ferdinand III, a Jew committed a robbery and murder of a Christian jeweller. The perpetrator was sentenced to be hanged by his feet between two large dogs. The perpetrator was sentenced to be hanged by his feet between two large dogs. Only through generous gifts and the intercession of the Empress did the Jews obtain a commuted punishment to being broken alive by the wheel, combined with pincer grips and molten lead. In Hanau in 1617, two Jewish thieves were also hanged on the gallows to languish slowly after being covered in nightcaps to protect them from the sun and rain. A pamphlet was immediately published about this, making a fuss about the "annoying innovations introduced in

the empire". This innovation, however, was not found in the cruel nature of the punishment, but in the fact that rabbis had prepared the condemned for death and accompanied them to the high court, and that the body of one of them had been dug up again and handed over to the Jews for burial in another place for money.

Finally, Christianity was also believed to be honoured not only by forcing the Jews to wear special insignia, but also in some places by subjecting them to hatred and contempt through certain acts. The yellow ring on the clothing, which the Jew had to wear in most states, or the horned hat, which he had to wear in Austria, may appear to be police trifles, and the slap in the face, which the syndic of Toulouse dealt out to the Jewish council at the high church festivals, belong only to the Middle Ages; but in Frankfurt am Main, two centuries ago, a public painting of shame was still seen on the bridge tower [1]), which served to keep alive the disgust and scorn against the Jews. The upper part of the picture showed the corpse of a Christian child, pierced many times with awls; in the lower field a Jew rode on a pig, holding its tail instead of the bridle, other Jews were busy eating the various secretions of the pig, and a devil was feasting on the sight of it all. When the tower was being repaired, the Jews offered a lot of money in vain for the removal of this image.

---

1) The Frankfurt bridge tower was decorated with plentiful paintings: around 1500, the city council decided to supplement it with a so-called Judensow. Despite protests by the Jewish community, this stayed in place until the tower was demolished; it even was renewed multiple times.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alte_Br%C3%BCcke_(Frankfurt)

Let us turn to the second point, the patron's interest.

Above all, the German Jew paid his annual protection money. According to the laws of the Reich, there was to be no arbitrary increase in this amount; it was based on local custom or mutual agreement. The amount of the protection money therefore varied greatly, especially depending on whether other monetary benefits were either included in it or existed alongside it under their own names. Landed nobility used to make special arrangements. While the Hessian Jew in the fifteenth century paid 3 to 4 Rhenish guilders a year, the Württemberg Jew around the same time paid 25, sometimes even 50 guilders. In more recent times, Frankfurt only took

1 gulden 30 kreuzer, but also 2 gulden 30 kreuzer every three years for the renewal of the protection and 1 gulden 56 kreuzer in fees for the oath and inscription, not counting the additional fees paid by the community on New Year's Day and at the fairs. In Brunswick, the tax for a man and his family was for a long time 3 thalers, for a single man or a widow and her family one thaler; in 1620, however, it rose to 10 thalers plus a one-off levy of the fiftieth pfennig from the estates. An Electoral Saxon decree of 1767 stipulated that a Jew who resides in Dresden or Leipzig with an electoral passport pays 70 Thaler per year for himself, 30 Thaler for his wife and 5 Thaler for each child; in the other cities only half the amount is paid. In Brandenburg, protection under the Great Elector cost 8 thalers; under Frederick William I, the entire Jewish community of the monarchy (about 1600 families) paid 15,000 thalers, but under Frederick II, since 1768, 25,000 thalers.

As a rule, not only the entire Jewish community was liable for the payment of the protection money, but a deposit was also made by the individual immediately upon admission. Delinquency in Hesse-Kassel resulted in double payment.

Certain other benefits were associated with the protection money under various names, sometimes of a collective nature, sometimes of an individual nature, sometimes permanent, sometimes only incidental. In Frankfurt, ordinary taxation applied to assets that were not allowed to fall below 1000 guilders without loss of protection. In taxes the Jews were usually treated on an equal footing with the Christians, in customs duties on goods. Frederick II of Prussia demanded 12,000 marks of silver from the Jewish community for the mint and 4800 thalers in recruitment fees. In 1722, the Jews were required to pay a levy of domestic cloth from the storehouse valued at 10,000 thalers a year, a requirement that was later abolished through annual monetary taxes on individuals. The right to marry a second child on Prussian soil was granted to the entire community for 70,000 Thaler, but in each individual case domestic manufactured goods had to be purchased for export for 1500 Thaler. The royal porcelain factory was granted special privileges for Jewish weddings and house purchases; in addition, every election of the community elders, indeed, every fire place entailed its own levies. In Hesse-Kassel the entire Jewish community paid 1000 guilders of so-called silver money, in Hesse-Darmstadt silver, wax and horse money and "tongue money" from the slaughter cattle. In the latter state, the Jews paid ordinary taxes in the same amount as the Christians, as well as an allowance for exemption from the duty of keeping house and personal night watch. Under Ernst Ludwig, the Jewish butchers had to keep the Landgrave's hunting dogs; in the case of seizures, the Jews had to "take the pledges for themselves" at a

cheap price; a foreign Jew paid a guilder "Schmusgeld" (sales fee) when buying cattle.

We pass over here the protection and coronation fees, the so-called sacrificial pennies, the bed, parchment and kitchen taxes, and other levies which the Jews of the imperial cities had to pay to the emperor, sometimes regularly, sometimes extraordinarily. It should only be mentioned that the Jews also paid double the tax to the Imperial Council in matters of justice and mercy.

The iura stolae (contributions to the clergy) were also not waived for the Jews. The consideration, already expressed at a council in Vienna in 1267, that Christians should actually live in their places of residence and that the Jews therefore had to compensate the clergy for the disadvantage they suffered as a result, applied here. The Giessen professor and later minister von Gatzert made the following argument: "Convertendus, qui ipse converti impie detrectat, intuitu ecclesiae pro iam converso habendus et per fictionem fieri parochianus habendus est, qui vere talis effici frivole recusat " (a person to be converted, who himself impiously refuses to be converted, is to be considered in the eyes of the church as already converted and is to be considered to have become a parishioner through fiction, who truly frivolously refuses to become such.) The practice, however, was different. Here and there the Jews had to contribute to the upkeep of the churches, at least the towers and clocks, also to the bell-ringer's salary, and as householders they also had to supply money, bread, fruit etc. to pastors and schoolteachers. In Hanover, a Jew who lived in an entire house paid 6, later 3 Thaler a year for the iura stolae, a tenant I Thaler, in Berlin a house owner 1 Thaler. In Mainz, the Jewish community gave fifteen St. Martin's geese to the chapter, fish to the Franciscans, Capuchins and Jesuits during Lent, a pike to the university rector during Easter week, 24 guilders to the chapter for the synagogue, and a gold guilder to the archipresbyter for each house. The parish of St. Emmeran received 1 gulden 48 kreuzer for the death of a married Jew, 54 kreuzer for the death of an unmarried Jew, 26 gulden a year for bells and 24 gulden per iuribus circumcisionis (the rights of circumcision). The protection fee for individuals in Mainz was also 24 guilders per year.

A tax of a quite peculiar kind, which was incumbent on the German Jew, was the Leibzoll (residence toll), which in various regions also appears under the names Jew toll, residence levy, Jewish registration toll, Personal excise and Jewish passage fee. This duty had to be paid as often as the Jew crossed the border of another area or even just another district from his homeland. It included neither customs duties on

goods nor trade concessions; the Jew paid, as for every pack of goods or every calf he carried with him, so also - to use the official expression - for his own "poor body", and usually from turnpike to turnpike. In many countries he was only free in his home district. However, Brandenburg, Hanover and Electoral Saxony only allowed foreign Jews to pay duty; for nationals, the duty was included in the protection money. In Bavaria, this duty was even levied on Jewish corpses brought to a foreign burial site.

The oldest mention of the body tax is found in the fourteenth century in Thuringia. Originally, it was undoubtedly only remuneration for a security escort that was given to Jews from outside the district or country. The general protection of the emperor had early on been replaced by the special protection of the various sovereigns, which did not extend beyond the borders of their own territory. The imperial decree of 1442 already excluded the Jews from the persons expressly included in the peace. An unaccompanied Jew on foreign territory was considered an exile and a commoner who had no security of person. The Jews were therefore forced to buy security for their travels, which was sometimes provided by real escorts (living escorts), sometimes by passes (dead escorts). Later the matter was merely a financial one.

These customs duties were not the same in all places, neither in amount nor in duration of validity. Although the imperial laws referred to custom and forbade unauthorized increases, here too arbitrariness had its mostly unhindered course. Whereas in Anspach, for example, only 5 kreuzer was paid for two weeks, in Baden 24 kreuzer was only enough for a single week. In most cases, as in Hesse, the ticket was only valid for twenty-four hours, and when new borders were passed, not even that long. The Rhine Count of Dhaun took 5 albus a day, the foreign Jew in Electoral Saxony paid 18 gGr. a day for each person in the large and medium-sized towns, but half that amount in the smaller towns and villages.

It is not our intention to tire you out with a complete tariff. Let us just cite a few more obvious examples. A Jew from Friedberg paid 12 kreuzer for a journey to Frankfurt, 23 kreuzer to Wetzlar and 27 kreuzer to Giessen in the bordering Wetterau region. At fair time, a Jew had to pay the following to Giessen when he visited Frankfurt for the journey there and back on horseback: in Giessen itself one Ortsthaler, in Butzbach one guilder, in Oberroßbach half a guilder. If a non-local Jew came to Kassel in 1749, he had to pay one ducat in advance for each stay overnight;

this continued until the third year, when it was decided to reduce the tax to 4 gGr. for residents and 8 gGr. for non-residents.

Several times, there were also considerations about levying the personal toll in one fell swoop. In 1766, for example, the Electorate of Mainz wanted to force foreign Jews to pay a so-called "pocket escort" of 24 guilders for the whole year. However, the neighbouring governments protested against this, and Hanau even retaliated. Following a complaint by the Frankfurt Jews, the Imperial Court of Justice issued a ban. Similar aversion payments had already been attempted before in Hesse-Darmstadt, Hanau, Würtemberg and elsewhere, but had subsequently been abandoned.

Reduction of the residence duty to half was granted in various states for women, complete exemption for children under ten, twelve or fourteen years of age and for beggar Jews. Hesse also allowed eight days of freedom before and just as much after the Jewish country days for those who had to attend them, as well as at the annual fairs. The same exemption applied at the Leipzig fairs. Traveling Jews paid nothing in some countries, at least on the Sabbath.

The third main aspect of the Jewish regulations can be seen in the provisions aimed at protecting civil society against the Jews.

Certain restrictions already applied to their admission. In Hesse-Kassel, the person to be admitted had to be born in the state, be the eldest son of the first marriage, be twenty-five years old, provide proof of his own assets of 500 thalers and also provide a certificate and surety from the Jewish community. Since 1751, the second son could also be exempted if he owned 1000 Thaler. In Hesse - Darmstadt a minimum of 300, then 400, and since Ernst Ludwig 600 guilders applied; in Electoral Mainz 1500 for residents and 3000 guilders for non-residents. As the estates and citizens often complained about an excessive increase in the number of Jews, a maximum number of Jewish families was sometimes set, e.g. in Frankfurt in 1613 at five hundred.

Land ownership and agriculture were completely forbidden to Jews in some places, in others it was at least very difficult. Although there are no traces of Jews farming in Hesse-Kassel from older times, from 1739 they were forbidden to cultivate mortgaged or leased fields themselves. If a Jew bought a house in Hesse-Darmstadt with a dispensation from the sovereign, the Christian seller still had a right of retraction, initially for ever, later for thirty years, since 1774 for one year,

but the buyer had to pay 20 or 40 gulden for the sovereign's consent. From 1805, the right to retract was reduced to three months and only abolished completely in 1812. In German cities, Jews were generally not allowed to own a house in the main streets. The Jewish quarter in Frankfurt was built in 1462, when the Jews had to give up their homes scattered around the city; the council was entitled to direct ownership, while the Jews were entitled to usable property in return for an annual rent.

Jews were not allowed to practise guild trades, although they were generally not prevented from having their butchers, bakers, brewers, shoemakers, etc. among them. Their trading powers were often subject to very narrow restrictions. They were only allowed to trade wine, fruits and new clothes in Mainz at the beginning of the last century, and hawking such goods only later. The trading instinct of this people was feared, often to the pure disadvantage of the producers. Where they were not completely excluded from certain branches of trade, they were at least forced to follow suit. At the fairs in Kassel, at the annual and weekly markets in Hesse-Darmstadt, Christians had the right of first refusal; in Frankfurt, Jews were not allowed to appear before seven o'clock in the summer or eight o'clock in the winter to buy victuals. Count Ludwig von Isenburg of Offenbach complained that the Jews' purchases of the oxen, calves, mutton, chickens, eggs, cheese, tree fruit, etc. necessary for his farm were being greatly disadvantaged. He therefore decreed in 1585: " In the event that provisions or other goods are available for purchase from our highly motivated subjects, which we do not require for our court, these shall first be offered to our officials, mayors, and aldermen in each locality, and if no one wishes to purchase them, then a Jew, in the absence of other merchants, ... that same at a fair price, and in no other way, may and shall have the power to accept." The Frankfurt residence code (Jewish policy) forbade Jews to offer their goods to passers-by or guests in the hostels. Of course, the Jews did not abide by this and in any case had a large influx of local Christians who preferred to buy their clothing and other necessities from them rather than from their co-religionists. The statute also prohibited the trade in bound books. Nevertheless, there were Jewish second-hand bookshops in Frankfurt, through which the best and even new books could often be bought for half the price. This was due to the fact that Christian publishers often took the capital for their business from the Jews and then, after the first or second fair, gave the entire remainder of the edition in the lowest possible price in lieu of payment.

Thus, Christian incompetence ruined its own profits and then sought protection from Jewish superiority, which was often equally useful to Christian consumers and producers alike, in the form of legal restrictions and intervention by the authorities; even preachers lent themselves to this cause, preparing a soft pillow of rest for it with moving addresses to the listening public.

Incidentally, as Wagenseil [1]), who is rich in observations, assures us, the outflanking of Christian trade was very often based on reasons against which no authority in the world was able to do anything. The Jew lived in modest frugality and therefore only needed a moderate profit, whereas the Christian merchant did not want to do without a more lavish lifestyle and a certain representation of the house; therefore, the Jew often very soon came to be called the rich Jew when his business was more lively, while the Christian often had trouble to avoid bankruptcy after a short period of business. The only thing that could help here was to completely disallow them from operating.

---

1) Johann Christoph Wagenseil (1633–1705) was a German historian, Orientalist, jurist and Christian Hebraist. As an accomplished Hebrew/talmud scholar he devoted his learning to exposing anti-Christian works of Jewish authors. He implored the authorities to restrain the Jews from mocking Jesus, Mary, the cross, the mass, and Christian teachings. He was opposed to forcible baptism and similar conversion measures, and devoted a treatise to refuting the charge of ritual murder.

The fear of Jewish competition was certainly the main reason why various German trading cities, such as Cologne, Nuremberg, Ulm and Augsburg, did not tolerate any settled Jews and in some cases had imperial privileges granted for this reason. Foreigners had to be accompanied and guarded by a paid city servant when they entered Nuremberg or Augsburg, so that they did not engage in commercial transactions. The consideration of whether the Jews were less harmful in towns or in the countryside also caused sway in the legislation here and there. In Hesse-Kassel, Hedwig Sophie drove all Jews from the towns to the villages in 1665, Landgrave Frederick II expelled them back to the towns in 1773, and William IX repealed the latter decree.

Various other restrictions had also been introduced in the interests of security. According to the Reichs Gazette, no claim of a Jew against a Christian could be assigned to another Christian; in Frankfurt it was forbidden to trade at night or to accept pledges; sureties and bonds were subject to certain restrictions; Jewish debts

became time-barred after two years; the Hebrew script was forbidden for contracts and trade books. According to canon and civil law, a Jew should not be admitted as a witness against a Christian; exceptions to this were subject to certain conditions.

An important point of legislation that was often violated in practice was the interest rate. The Imperial Police Regulations of 1530 and 1577 permitted 5 percent, but the latter also allowed the individual imperial states to make modifications. While no exceptions were ever made in favour of Christians, individual states applied a higher rate for the Jews. Hesse-Darmstadt allowed 6 percent, Frankfurt 8 percent for a pledge, 10 percent for manuscripts, Hesse-Kassel 6 percent for loans over 20 thalers and 8 percent for smaller loans. These concessions are relatively small, if it is true what is reported that Sixtus V, into whose treasury enormous sums flowed from the Jews, charged the latter 15 and 18 percent in Italy; Gregory XIII even mentions 24.

The legal interest rates were now also frequently exceeded in Germany, especially in the case of so-called weekly usury, i.e. small loans for a short period of time, which was particularly common among the impecunious Jews. In Frankfurt, where the majority of Jews were still poor at the beginning of the last century, 20, 40 and even more percent were taken, and in addition the interest was immediately deducted from the capital in advance. In Prague they went even higher. Emperor Matthias threatened anyone who took more than 5 percent with infamous punishment and with the loss of a quarter of the capital debt. But Christians also engaged in various forms of weekly usury, or gave their money to the Jews for further use for 8 or 10 percent. Jesuits in Poland lent to noblemen at twelve per cent; a respected patrician in Giessen, according to his own records, made several small advances on pledges in 1723 and took 43 1/3, or even 65 per cent, which he retained in part when he borrowed; Wagenseil knew Christians who even took one kreuzer a week from the florin, which amounts to 86 2/3 per cent for the year.

With regard to the oath, the belief prevailed until recent times that the Jews were very unscrupulous towards Christians. It was believed that a Jew considered an oath he had sworn to be invalid as soon as he declared before the rabbi or three witnesses that he repented and sought absolution. In addition, every year on the Feast of Atonement, the Jews were to declare all vows to be sworn in the following year to be non-binding and all knowingly false oaths to be no oaths. That is why the oath of a Jew was tied to a highly cumbersome and humiliating ceremonial and to gruesome self-curses in the event of perjury. In the Middle Ages, the person

swearing was made to step barefoot and in a bare shirt onto the skin of a mother pig, later he had to be dressed at least in his death garment and have put on the prayer belt. The main oath was preceded by a preparatory oath relating to the recognition of the correctness and binding nature of the formalities. The form which the Imperial Chamber Court prescribed for this is well known, but to some scholars it still seemed far from sufficient, and the Hessian jurist Ester in particular recommended the most complicated precautions for Jewish oaths. The most atrocious curse formula, however, is perhaps the one disclosed by Wagenseil. Lovers of the hair-raising can read it in Pfeffinger's Commentar zu Vitriarius [1]).

---

1) Johann Friedrich Pfeffinger (1667-1730). In the area of German constitutional law, he created his main work, the "Vitriarius illustratus." a commentary on the jus publicum of the Leiden professor Philipp Reinhard Vitriarius (1647-1720). From 1673 onward Ph.Vitriarius taught constitutional law in Geneva and at Leiden university from 1682 where he was succeeded by his son Johann Jacob. The posthumous reputation of the elder V. rests on his "Institutiones juris publici", or more accurately on the commentary written on it by professor Pfeffinger.

These were the conditions in which the Jews continued to live in the greater part of the Christian West for the next two centuries after the Reformation. Without civil rights, even without the security of a permanent residence, almost universally excluded from land ownership and agriculture, everywhere not admitted to guild trades and guild-like commerce, rejected by society, humiliated by the laws, burdened with taxes of every kind, the Jew had to remain in those times as the Middle Ages had handed him down, as popular opinion still views him today, and as he - let us only admit it - to some extent still really is. It is not Judaism, but the external situation which people had imposed on the Jews, that is to be accused when Jewish wickedness is spoken of. Dependent on the most philistine of all trades, on the almost only one that had been left to him, on the junk, livestock and money-grubbing business, he often had to scrape together in small amounts, but incessantly, what he needed not only to satisfy his own needs, but also to satisfy the authorities and distinguished patrons, if his own personal lot was to improve. The mental calculation of percentages neither brings understanding in a sympathetic way, nor does it promote the flourishing of ideas, the sense for art and science, especially when for the latter, access to places of education, the prospect of recognition, and even application in life are almost entirely denied. It is a mistake to speak so generally of the great treasures of the Jews; only a few were actually rich, not everyone would have made it as a crown agent or financial agent. The poverty

that prevailed among a large part of Frankfurt's Jewish community, and especially among those who practiced the weekly usury, is also acknowledged by Schudt [1]), their zealous opponent; the misery in the Jewish quarter in Friedberg, which sixty years ago numbered about 470 souls, was great, and yet on average there were still about 1700 beggar Jews passing through every year. It was therefore often enough only Jewish need, which was based on the exploitation of Christian poverty, but also on Christian brotherhood and foolishness.

---

1) Johann Jakob Schudt (1664 –1722) was a German polyhistor and Orientalist. His "Jüdische Merckwürdigkeiten (Jewish curiosities)" repeats many of the stories published by Johann Andreas Eisenmenger; but also contains details of contemporary Jewish life.

Eisenmenger (1654- 1704) sought to expose the allegedly secret and nefarious practices of Jews, and claimed that Judaism was a false religion that had been invented by the ancient Israelites in an attempt to deceive the world.

Society sought the remedy for the evil less in the removal of the causes than in cautions against the phenomena, and the Jewish ordinances and other restrictive laws with which it sought to protect itself were often only as many sources that constantly generated and maintained the evil, especially where corrupt or negligent officials did not even intervene against the phenomena. The inappropriate and unstatesmanlike nature of those institutions has been judged by history itself. But it was also an unfair judgment when the Jews were constantly blamed for exploiting the only land left to them, when they were scolded for not practicing agriculture and handicrafts, both of which were barred to them by law, and for not stepping out of a segregation that they themselves maintained by all means, by locking them in special alleys, forcing them to wear badges, and fleeing their company as unclean.

If the Jews were to become different, the position of state society towards them had to be different first. More recent times have realized this, and the change resulting from this insight has not been to the detriment of either side. But, of course, the work is still far from being completed, both geographically and in terms of its internal development. Just as the modern idea of the state and the Christian idea of humanity develop in other areas only in a continuous struggle, so it has been here too, and so the end of the day will not come for a long time yet.

Individual voices for a better position for the Jews may have been raised in earlier times, but a more vigorous approach to progress only began around the middle of

the last century. Let us take a brief look at the course of the reform ideas and the resistance they encountered.

We have already touched on Luther's milder view above. His view of the matter appears even more definite when we read the following admonitions from him: "It would be my request and my advice that the Jews should be dealt with carefully and taught from the Scriptures, so that more might convert. But at present we try drive with them by force and make untrue allegations, blaming them for Christ's death which they must atone for, and what is more foolish, that we treat them like dogs, what good will that achieve? Also, that they are forbidden to work and labour and to socialize normally, since they are driven to usury, how can they improve? If one wants to help them, one must not practice Christian love toward them as the Pope does, but rather accept them kindly, allow them to work and earn a living, so that they may gain motivation and opportunity to be with us, to hear and see our Christian teaching and life. If some are stubborn, what does that matter? After all, we are not all good Christians either."

Unfortunately, this enlightened view, entirely worthy of the Reformer, was not what impressed the vast majority of Lutheran theologians; they far preferred to join in the vehement tone in which Luther had once, excited by the writings of converted Jews, poured out his displeasure at the iniquities alleged there and his anger against their authors. The zealous Nigrinus' outbursts have already been mentioned in Part 1, but no less the more mature opinion of William of Hesse [1]), who did not deny the school of his father Philip. In the same spirit, which is expressed in Christoph von Würtemberg's [2]) words quoted above, a series of writings appeared in the course of the years, which were sometimes inspired by theological rigorism, sometimes by habitual conversionism. The jurists usually swam with the current or lavished back and forth; sometimes they were strict with the theologians, sometimes they proved the stateliness of toleration when the government tended towards the latter. The "Jewish Faith" of Antonius Margarita [3]) and the "Jewish Enemy" of Nigrinus [1]) were followed by Johannes Schmidt's „Feuriges Drachengift," (Fiery Dragon Venom) [4]), Serpelii's "Judaeus conversus et perversus", "Usury Enemy's Jewish Spit," a "Jewish Mirror," Schwabe's "Jewish Cloak," Brentzen's "Jewish Skinned Snake" and many other books whose direction is already sufficiently indicated in their titles.

---

1) William IV of Hesse-Kassel (24 June 1532 – 25 August 1592), also called William the Wise, was the first Landgrave of the Landgraviate of Hesse-Kassel (or Hesse-Cassel). He was the son of Philip I, Landgrave of Hesse (1504–1567), also called the Magnanimous, who was a

German nobleman and champion of the Protestant Reformation, notable for being one of the most important of the early Protestant rulers in Germany.

2) Christoph of Württemberg (1515–1568), ruled as Duke of Württemberg from 1550 until his death in 1568.

3) Anton Margaritha (also known as Antony, Anthony, Antonius) (born ca. 1500) was a sixteenth-century Jewish Hebraist and convert to Christianity. He was a possible source for some of Martin Luther's conception of Judaism.

4) “Feuriger Drachen Gifft Und Wütiger Ottern-Gall” (Fiery Dragon Venom and Furious Viper Bile) - with which the devil's serfs, the Jewish people, through horrible and abominable blasphemy, defilement, cursing, lying, writing, deceit, and other inhuman wickedness, freely feed and water the holy Triune God, ... as well as the entire precious Christian community ...

Fettmilch's persecution of the Jews in Frankfurt (1614), although bloodily punished by the emperor and council as an outrage against the authorities, rustled a lot of feathers against the Jews in particular over the next few years. The somewhat more peaceful expulsion in Worms (1615) also contributed to this. The question of whether expulsion or toleration with the utmost restriction was dealt with anew. The point of view from which conditional tolerance was taken is best shown by the reasons given to justify it, which were mostly taken from other things rather than from the main issue. For example it was stated that the conversion of the Jews was still to be hoped for according to the ancient prophecies; they had been given to us by God as librarians who, with their knowledge of Hebrew and Chaldean, could bear witness against the unbelieving Gentiles; they were a living mirror of God's wrath, which burns and remains upon all those who do not obey his Son; they were a monument of divine punishment, but a monument should not be destroyed; under Christian authority they lived in far greater servitude and imprisonment than among the Turks and other unbelievers, "through divine grace, they may be more easily persuaded to abandon their superstitions and ultimately convert to Christianity; one also senses that many among the Christians are becoming somewhat accustomed to the grievous avarice, which is the root of all evil, through the unjust usury of the Jews, when they recognize and learn to hate the same in them as the devil's invention, to their own detriment and that of other Christians; but when they do not see the same in the Jews, they unfortunately practice it all too much and too crudely among themselves." etc.

Anyone who thought more mildly of Judaism and Jews, who, for example, did not regard it as an abomination that Christians performed certain services for Jews on

the Sabbath, was a Judaizer to the theologians. Jewish authorities had to put up with harsh words; Hugo Grotius [1]) was regarded as a Judaizer by the zealous.

---

1) Hugo Grotius (1583 –1645), also known as Hugo de Groot, was a Dutch humanist, diplomat, lawyer, theologian, jurist, statesman, poet and playwright.

During its war of liberation against Spain, the Republic of Holland exempted numerous Jews who had migrated from Spain and Portugal; it gained in them wealthy inmates and active allies against its enemies. The position of these "Portuguese" was quite favourable. Education and prosperity enabled them to participate in all branches of industry, right up to the printing press. Portuguese also settled in Hamburg; one Jewish merchant was himself a guest of Christina's of Sweden [1]). The fact that Johann de Witt also had an annual pension paid to the almost reluctant Spinoza, and that this philosopher, in spite of being banned from the synagogue, never separated himself from the Jewish community, was able to receive a call to Heidelberg, is one of the remarkable, although isolated, signs of a time that also granted asylum to a Cartesius (Descartes) in Holland. It was from Holland that the Portuguese spread to the British Isles when England challenged their supremacy at sea. Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel, a scholar who was honored by men such as Bochart, Grotius, Dionysius Vossius, and Pococke, had already taken steps with Cromwell in this regard, and the Protector had not been at all averse to encouraging the readmission of a people who could be of such great use to English trade.; but the cache was not then completed, and it was not till the reign of Charles II. that more numerous immigrations took place, and, it would seem, without troublesome restrictions. In order to satisfy popular opinion, Manasseh interwove among other motives for the admission the consideration that, according to the general belief, redemption was near, and that this could not occur until the complete dispersion of the Jewish people was a fact.

---

1) Christina (Swedish "Kristina", 1626–1689), was Queen of Sweden from 1632 until her abdication in 1654.

The messianic hopes inspired by Sabbatai Zevi, who himself soon converted to Islam, misled some of the Western Jews, with lasting consequences, and prevented Christians from judging favourably a people that now seemed to feel whole again. However, even at the outset, very important men such as Jakob Sasportas in Hamburg opposed the ensuing delusion.

Around that time, Leopold I expelled his residents, mostly poor people, from Austria, with the exception of his court factor Schlesinger; however, limited admissions and permits for trade in horses, silk, and jewels were soon granted again. In Brandenburg, on the other hand, the great Elector favoured the settlement of wealthy and blameless families in the interests of trade; the objections of the estates went unheeded, and one Jew was even granted a monopoly on tobacco. King Frederick I supported the reprinting of Eisenmenger's book (1711), which had been suppressed by the imperial authorities, a work which, according to Michaelis' statement, combined great scholarship with a great injustice of judgment; he also ordered a commissioner to attend prayers in the synagogues in order to counter the blasphemies of Christianity claimed by the proselytes; on the whole, however, the treatment of the Jews once they had been admitted was rather lenient under him as well.

Eisenmenger's "Entdecktes Judenthum" did not at all bring about the persecution that one might have expected from this work. Perhaps even less effective was Schudt, rector of the grammar school in Frankfurt, whose "Jüdische Denkwürdigkeiten" ("Jewish Memorabilia") in two thick volumes (1714-1718) compiled all kinds of new and old stories and anecdotes about the Jews in as much disorder as uncritical gossip, so that even "der Frankfurter und and andrer Juden Gestank" ("the Frankfurt and other Jews' stench") has its own chapter and addendum. It was the time when the enlightened and more humane view of things, which in the theological field is denoted by Spener's [1]) name and in the legal field by Thomasius', [2]) was already beginning to emerge.

---

1) Philipp Jakob Spener (1635–1705) was a German Lutheran theologian who essentially founded what became known as Pietism.

2) Christian Thomasius (1655–1728) was a German jurist and philosopher.

"One of the greatest obstacles to the instruction of the Jews - says Spener - is that they generally all grow up in idleness from their youth, spend most of their lives in such a way, and generally all support themselves on trading and haggling, while never finding work. This is partly through no fault of their own, since they do not have their own land to cultivate, nor are they admitted in most places to trades, or to learn or practise them; but in part it is not without their own fault, since, even if they were allowed to work, they would not understand it due to laziness. As for the poor among them, whose number always makes up the largest part, both among

them and among Christians, it is a sheer impossibility that someone without tricks and deceit, with barely a few thalers as capital, could convert it by action in such a way that he should be able to support a family from it, however well he behaves; therefore, these wretched people can think of nothing else day and night but how to spend their poor lives with cunning, intrigue, deceit, and thus theft."

Around the same time, at the university where Christian Thomasius and Just Henning Böhmer worked, a young man from Halle defended his own dissertation De cauta Judaeorum tolerantia under the latter's chairmanship. Bastineller, the author of this work, also found that the Jews' tendency towards usury was essentially due to their social position, which made any other form of acquisition almost impossible for them. However, he seeks the reason for this restricted position in the traditional hatred of Christians, especially the clergy. Tolerance, the lowest level of love, and indeed towards beings whom God created just as good as Christians, is commanded by nature and reason; through tolerance a cultured people is distinguished from a barbaric one. If the difference in religion were a just reason for expulsion, then this would also have been the right of the pagans against the Christians. Moreover, according to Burmann and Soldanus, Christianity was only an improved Judaism. - As far as the abolition of fraud, usury and thievery is concerned, the author certainly demands an extension of the trade license, but hardly knows how to suggest any other information than that the Jews, who would never be tolerated by Christian guilds, should be united in special quarters to form guilds among themselves and be obliged to work in crafts, which would in any case make a healthy competition for the often far more unfair Christian craftsmen. Bastineller did not yet dare to propose freedom of land ownership and agriculture.

Thus, in the scientific literature there were individual signs that one was about to get to the true cause of the phenomena. In real life, however, there was still no sign of a change in the treatment of the German Jews. The fact that Frederick I allowed his court Jew Gumpertz to carry a sword was only a meaningless favoritism of an individual, and Süss Oppenheimer's land-destroying mischief in Stuttgart under Karl Alexander belongs even less here.

After some time, however, the surprise came from a source that astonished the whole of Europe. In 1740, just two hundred years after the expulsion by Charles V, Charles III of Naples called the Jews from East and West back to his country for fifty years with unheard-of privileges. His explicit motive for this was that the Neapolitans and Sicilians, who were ignorant of such matters, should learn from this people, who

were capable of trading, how to conduct trade in the most remote countries by means of shipping. As great as the idea was, the announced enterprise quickly and completely failed. Although there was no lack of immigrants willing to settle, the reluctance of the people, which was supported by the preaching of the Jesuits and Capucins, the insults and mistreatment of individuals and the clear threat of a general massacre of the Jews caused the newcomers to leave the country again.

The King of Naples' move had also caused a stir in Germany and no doubt raised concerns in some circles about possible imitation. For this reason, the legal dissertation literature began to stir again. At the newly founded Georgia Augusta, a Dr. Jung defended a treatise De iure recipiendi Judaeos under Ayrer's chairmanship, in which the following arguments could still be found: Christ has often declared the Jews to be bad people; they have allowed many prophetic books to be lost or even destroyed; of three thousand psalms, only a few are left; the Jews thirst for Christian blood, poison the wells, counterfeit the coin, betray the Christians to the Turks, encourage sedition, do not want to cultivate crops or do handicrafts, blaspheme Christ and swear false oaths.

In England, the Jews had long enjoyed a freer position under the House of Hanover. They engaged in wholesale trade, like those of Holland, Benedig and Livorno; there were no complaints about usury. They stood up to the pretender, not without personal risk and financial sacrifice. In order to give the Protestant party greater strength, it was considered in Parliament to grant naturalization to foreign Protestants. However, it was soon argued that far greater advantages could be expected from the immigration of rich Jewish families, because foreign Protestants would probably only come if their wealth was not yet considerable. Therefore, in 1753, the ministry introduced a bill for the naturalization of Jews. This was passed in both houses. But the people, who feared to see their religion, their trade and their English nationality endangered, put up such resistance that the bill was revoked as soon as it had been passed.

In the meantime, however, the great struggle had begun in the literary field, which in its successes created the character of the new age in science and public life. In England the so-called freethinkers, in Germany academic teachers like Mascov and Justi, statesmen like Justus Möser, Karl Moser and Christian Wilhelm Dohm, philosophers like Lessing, Herder and Kaut, in France Montesquieu, the encyclopaedists, Jean Jacques Rousseau and even Voltaire - they all played their part in the work, albeit to very different degrees and each in his own way. The war

against the absolute rule of authority in the intellectual and political sphere, the struggle against the traditional bourgeoisie, the assertion of the legitimacy of free philosophical thought against the dogmatism of an arrogant orthodoxy, the recognition of human rights and human dignity irrespective of birth - this was the goal towards which they all worked, some with the deepest conviction and moral seriousness, others not without frivolous admixture.

Of course, this struggle did not remain without further application to the circumstances of the Jews, these helots [1]) and pariahs of the Christian state, whom even the worst Christian looked down upon with contempt and who were nevertheless once again welcome in palaces and shelters, as emergency helpers in times of incapacity or as a mediator of the illicit in the dealings of Christians among themselves.

---

1) The helots were a subjugated population that constituted a majority of the territories ruled by Sparta in Ancient Greece.

Above all else, Lessing's effectiveness should be emphasized here. He, the Protestant in the best sense of the word, knew a Christianity other than the official one of the compendia and symbolic books. "The true Lutheran - he said - does not want to be protected by Luther's writings, he wants to be protected by Luther's spirit, and Luther's spirit absolutely requires that no man should be hindered in the knowledge of the truth at his own discretion." "Lessing - says Friedrich Schlegel - has in a certain sense completed what was begun by Luther: he has carried German Protestantism through to the end." "A right-thinker among the freethinkers," as Herder calls him, always filled with the most sincere striving for truth, he was an opponent of rigid confessionalism because he was a friend of religion and humanity. The essence of all religion, submission to God's will, the active love of man out of the fear of God, the unselfish practice of virtue, the non-condemnation of those of other faiths was also what seemed to him to be the innermost core of Christianity; and to peel this core out of the husks and chaff of school dogmatics and priestly practice, to sweep the steps of the temple of higher wisdom - as he says - that was, among the many things his genius attacked and mastered, his primary task in life and the object of a modest pride. In this respect, his Nathan [1]) is the focal point in which his ideas are united; but even earlier Lessing, the man of "salvations", had explained in his "Jews" what he thought of the prejudices of the confessions, and even when he entered the princely school at Meissen as a pupil, he had already spoken words that touched on the same theme in an admittedly still undeveloped way.

---

1) “Nathan the Wise” by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing is a plea for religious tolerance.

Alongside Lessing, his friend Moses Mendelssohn should also be mentioned. Just as Lessing opposed Christian exclusivism, Mendelssohn sought to free the Jews from the bonds of Talmudism and Rabbinism and thus initiate a reform of Judaism that would lead back from the ceremonial and authority system to the essential and universal truth in religion, which also lies in Moses and the prophets, and would preserve the subjective right of free research. A mutual rapprochement was then in the nature of things. To men like Lavater and Dohm, Mendelssohn almost seemed to be standing on Christian ground. This was wrong if it meant confessional Christianity, but right if it meant the most general basis of the Christian religion.

Mendelssohn was deeply impressed by Dohm's essay "On the Civil Improvement of the Jews", which appeared in the year of Lessing's death. It was the most decisive and far-reaching thing that had ever been said in a direct way about the emancipation of this people. Dohm criticizes the objections raised so far against the betterment of the Jews, explains the real existing damages from the inherited circumstances and proposes the civil freedom of the Jews to effectively remedy them. He demands for them equality of rights with all other subjects, admission to all trades, encouragement to farm, thereby indirectly and without coercion diverting the masses from trade, but for those who remain in trade, regular bookkeeping in the German language, furthermore admission to the pursuit of the arts and sciences and under certain conditions even to government service; He also requested care for better education, the removal of hateful influences by Christian teachers, a certain autonomy in civil matters which are connected to religious statutes, and finally complete religious freedom with the right which every ecclesiastical society is entitled to, to exclude dissident members for a time or forever, but without prejudice to civil rights and in accordance with the principles of generally recognised civil law..

These proposals went further than Mendelssohn, shy by nature and by his position as a Jew, might ever have proposed on his own. But he welcomed them wholeheartedly and supported them and the emancipation cause itself by seizing the opportunity to publicly polemicize against the right of excommunication reserved by Dohm for the rabbis and elders, which was in no way compatible with his reform ideas. "I know - he says - of no right to persons and things that is connected with and based on negations. - Least of all do I know of any right and

authority over opinions which religion is supposed to grant and which the church is supposed to possess. True religion presumes no power over opinions and judgments, gives and takes no claim to other goods, no right to enjoyment, possession and property, knows no other power than the power to win through reasons, to convince and to make blessed through conviction. The true, divine religion needs neither arms nor fingers for its use; it is pure mind and heart."

Mendelssohn's friends and successors, Wessely, the two Friedländers, Euchel, Bendavid, etc., continued the work that had been begun by seeking, through instruction and teaching of young people, to enable their fellow believers to distinguish the essential and enduring elements of religion from the incidental statutes that were only appropriate under certain conditions, to recognize their neighbours in members of other religions, and, in particular, to abandon the prejudices they had absorbed against Christianity. Here too, however, progress was slow. The internal struggle between Rabbinism and the Reform is still not complete, and there are phenomena on both sides that could be subject to rebuke; but both sides have so far proved in fact that at least their religion does not prohibit the Jew from becoming as capable a member of state society outside the promised land as the confessor of any other religion.

But even on the Christian side, things only progressed gradually. - Dohm's proposals have long since been realized in many countries and in some cases even surpassed; but in the beginning, they met with widespread opposition. "A flood of controversial writings" - says Jost - more or less prompted by Dohm's work, swept over the mass catalogues, and important scholars gave their voices amidst many shallow occasional writers. But the controversy had taken a different turn. Accusations of the murder of Christian children, of proselytizing, rebellion and disloyalty were almost no longer heard. On the other hand, the occupation of the majority, the associated offenses, fraud, theft, swindling, as well as lack of education, despondency, lack of patriotism, disgust at physical labour, obsessiveness of religious ceremonies, partisanship, party hatred, etc. were asserted by their opponents, while on the other hand, the forced restriction to poor trades, the burden of taxes, the insatiable desire for better things, the rejection of aspiring craftsmen from participation in guilds, exclusion from military service, external obstacles to religious reform, the removal of Jews from agriculture, their restriction to streets, expulsion from entire cities and regions, insults and abuse, and other evils as causes of those complaints. The philanthropy of the state administrators prevailed, and a hand was laid to eradicate the mutual grievances." So much for Jost.

In order to be able to assess the extent of progress, let us first consider the state of Jewish relations in the two largest German states at the time. In Austria, the expulsion of all Bohemian Jews had been decided in 1744, because some had come under suspicion of treason; however, the decision was immediately revoked when their innocence was proven. In Vienna, individual families such as the Arnsteins, the Eskeles, the Sinzheimers, the Schlesingers and so on lived in prestige and prosperity, running factories and manufactories. Maria Theresa issued a new Jewish ordinance. This forbade the ownership of land as well as lending on mortgages; house-renting and trade in foodstuffs were prohibited; on Christian holidays the Jews were not allowed to leave the house during the service; they were deprived of all jurisdiction.

In Prussia, Frederick II regulated Jewish conditions more than he favoured them. He transferred the legal and protective matters from the previous special Jewish commission to the ordinary authorities. At Mendelssohn's suggestion, he also dismissed the commissioner for guarding prayer, Alenu Leschabeach. He did not want an increase in the number of Jews and therefore tied the settlements to a certain amount of money and other conditions. The Jews were forbidden to engage in guild business, and factories, the establishment of which was, incidentally, welcomed, were permitted only with the highest approval; woollen cloth, linen, leather, food and raw natural products were excluded from their trade; landed estates could not be acquired at all, houses only with certain concessions. In matters of marriage, inheritance and guardianship, the rabbis were entitled to arbitration. We have already mentioned the taxes levied on Prussian Jews.

This was the state of affairs in Austria and Prussia, and to a large extent in the rest of Germany, when Dohm's work drew general attention to the need for reform.

Joseph II, the philanthropic reformer of his state, was not slow to respond. In the same year, his famous Edict of Toleration appeared, which was often greeted with astonishment and even celebrated in song by reformist Jews. For the time, it and the regulations that followed it marked a clear advance; but it did not go as far as many other reforms of this rapidly inflammable legislator. The Jews were allowed to live everywhere in the cities, in the country only exceptionally, had equal rights with the Christians in court, were liable to military service and capable of voluntary service, were allowed to enter medical and legal professions, wholesale and retail trade, as well as free trades, They were exempt from wearing a badge, had to use the German language and attend public educational institutions, were allowed to take part in public amusements, and even the prospect of acquiring the nobility of letters and

wearing a sword was not closed to them. Joseph also decreed that Jewish children were not allowed to convert to Christianity until the age of fourteen. Despite all this, however, the Jews always remained merely tolerated persons who had to pay protection money and taxes, and initially did not have the right to own land. It was not until several years later that Joseph also abolished the body tax and permitted land ownership of any kind.

Incidentally, Joseph's decree did not fail to attract the attention of princes in other German states. A report from the government of Dassel to the Duke, who had inquired about the applicability of the Austrian reforms to his state, provides us with information about the state of affairs in Hesse at the time. The elementary schools had long been attended by Jewish children, the Carolinum and the university also had individual Jewish students; the wearing of the yellow ring was unknown, the Jews wore fashionable clothes like the Christians; the ban on owning houses in the main streets was obsolete, trade was free, the exchange and silk goods trade was almost entirely in Jewish hands, only the cutting of garments with foreign cloths was the privilege of a guild; the use of German language and writing was required in stores. However, the government considered the organization of agriculture dangerous on police grounds and advised that the success of such a measure should be awaited in other countries.

Thus even at that time there was no lack of individual phenomena which showed that a new view of things was beginning to assert itself in the ruling circles. Germany, however, was destined to be overtaken and followed by other countries in the matter of emancipation. Two great world events, the formation of the North American Free States and the French Revolution, brought forward in fits and starts what would have been far from the goal by way of deliberate reform.

In 1789, the New York Congress, following the example of Pennsylvania, which had from the beginning practiced the principle of general religious toleration, proposed to the legislatures of the individual states that the following article be added to the Union Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion (state religion), or which may prevent the free exercise thereof." This proposal was immediately adopted and received constitutional confirmation in 1791. With this, the full citizenship of the Jews was decided by itself.

In France, Jewish communities were found almost exclusively in Alsace, Lorraine, Paris and Bordeaux, totalling around 50,000 heads. The Portuguese in Bordeaux lived in prestige and prosperity, while the Jews in Alsace and Lorraine were mostly

poor and opressed. Louis XVI had already done something for them before the Revolution, which deserves mention that was worthy of mention less for its material relief than for its humanitarian motives. In Alsace, too, there was a body tax (péage corporel); a foreign Jew had to pay three livres a day in Strasbourg and was not even allowed to do business in the city. In a decree dated January 12, 1784, Louis XVI announced the following: "We have seen in the course of Our perusal of the customs regulations that in the customs tariffs, especially in Our province of Alsace, Jews are taxed with a péage corporel upon entering the city of Strasbourg, which puts them on a par with cattle. Since it is now highly contrary to Our way of thinking to allow any of Our subjects to be subject to a duty that disgraces the status of man, We have hereby abolished it." Ludwig's example was followed the next year by Joseph II, and in 1787 by Frederick William II of Prussia.

Although such resolutions did not in themselves take the matter much further, they did draw public attention to the issue anew. Mirabeau, for example, took the opportunity to speak in favour of the Jews in general in his work on Moses Mendelssohn (1787). Then the Society of Sciences in Metz made the Jewish question a prize. To answer it, the Abbé Grégoire wrote his Essai sur la regeneration physique, politique et morale des Juifs (“Essay on the physical, political, and moral regeneration of the Jews”) (1788), in which he described the current state of the Jews in Lorraine in vivid colours and urgently recommended improvements.

It was not long before the revolution broke out. Human rights were discussed in Versailles, but at the same time the peasants of Alsace were also discussing plans for the complete extermination of the Jews. The Jews suddenly found themselves caught between the brightest hope and the greatest danger. Grégoire, then a deputy from Ranch, now also took them on. The result of the negotiations held in the National Assembly was that all Jews who took the oath of allegiance were declared to be true Frenchmen with full citizenship rights (1791). In this way, the legislation of a country that barely a century before had even exterminated or chased out its Christian dissidents went further than all the others in a single stroke.

France had indeed turned its Jews into Frenchmen in terms of attitude and interest. For the first time in so many centuries the foreigners among the Christian nations had again obtained a fatherland, and under the banners of the republic, as well as of the empire, they disproved by the deed the proposition, which even a Michaelis against Dohm had defended with learned effort, that the Jew was incapable of being a good soldier through religious and national prejudices.

It was to be expected that those countries which transformed their constitutions under French influence and according to French principles would also follow France's example in the Jewish question: Holland as a Batavian republic in 1796, the Grand Duchy of Berg in 1807, the Kingdom of Westphalia in 1808, Baden in 1809, the Grand Duchy of Frankfurt in 1810. Other Rhine states at least abolished the customs duty, granted Jews admission to public schools and made many other improvements, also in relation to crafts and agriculture.

It has already been mentioned that Prussia had abolished the body tax even before the revolution. Frederick William II, however, did not stop at this detail. He appointed a special commission to investigate the circumstances of the Jews, abolished the obligation to pay taxes in advance, abolished the synagogue tax and the joint liability for the taxes of individuals, and granted individual families permission to own property and full burgher rights in advance, while others were granted at least limited burgher rights. He was also prepared, within certain limits, to permit the pursuit of agriculture, crafts, the arts and sciences as soon as the young people were released from military service and other civic obligations. However, the reform work came to a standstill, partly due to the subsequent wars and partly due to the hesitation of the Jews themselves. But they were not forgotten. In the great process of internal reorganization that took place under Stein's and Hardenberg's ministries, the Jewish question could not be left out. The city ordinance of 1808 gave the Jews the right to become citizens of the city everywhere and to hold all municipal offices. In his edict of March 11, 1812, Frederick William III finally declared: "The Jews in our states are to be respected as foreigners and Prussian citizens."

Then came the wars of liberation. German Jews fought as volunteers or conscripts no less bravely alongside their German brothers in arms than French Jews fought under Napoleon's banners. "The other Jewish inhabitants, especially the women, joined the Christians in sacrifice of every kind." We have Hardenberg's explicit testimony to both, in addition to the general knowledge of the fact. The Jews were absorbed into the nations whose soil they inhabited and whose rights they shared.

The wars restored the independence of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck; but these cities wished to return their Jews to their former state of oppression. Frankfurt followed suit. Hardenberg and even Metternich took up the cause of the persecuted at the Vienna Congress. The former wrote to the Senate of Lübeck: "Prussia, by its

legislation, has set an example to the rest of Germany, and has led the way in the most complete conviction that, in order to remove the apprehensive disadvantages of the admission of the Jewish religious party into the fold of the state in the most expedient and certain manner, the only remedy left is to grant its members civil rights in return for the assumption of civil obligations." For the time being, the Congress protected the Jews in the possession of the rights hitherto granted to them in the individual federal states and entrusted the future Federal Assembly with the task of discussing "how the civil improvement of the confessors of the Jewish faith in Germany could be brought about in the most concordant manner possible, and in particular how the enjoyment of civil rights could be secured for them in return for the assumption of all civil obligations in the federal states." (Art. 16 of the B.-A.)

What the Federal Diet has or has not done in the matter in question since it convened, what has happened in the individual states of Germany and Europe in terms of progress, stagnation or regression, what the literature has brought for or against emancipation, we will not discuss further here, partly because it is still fresh in our minds, and partly because it would take us further than the limits of this treatise allow. A general view, however, of the present state of affairs shows us, according to the different countries, a great diversity, and in their extremes even an infinite distance from each other: in one state Jews as ministers, generals, members of legislative assemblies and of the highest learned bodies, as great landowners and holders of knightly rights, even as the spouses of Christians; in another, on the other hand, if not total exclusion, then inability to acquire even the smallest amount of land, inadmissibility to the smallest municipal office, deprivation of Christian service under secular and spiritual punishment, adherence to the old formula of the Jewish oath, restriction to usury, haggling and all the physical and moral misery of the ghetto. In some countries legislation cannot do more for the Jews than it has already done. But the administration, without which the best law is nothing, can do it by continuing to discard traditional prejudices, and finally the Jews themselves can do it by recognizing that the equality of the whole before the law does not relieve the individual of the care of acquiring the position he wishes to occupy in society by personal qualities, by education and assimilation. Rapprochement here can only occur through mutual movement, and much has already happened in this respect among the educated of both sections. In the masses, however, prejudices and aversions on the one hand need time to expire, just as on the other hand, ingrained errors and certain social unpleasantnesses must be given time to disappear.

The Negro Question and the Latest Events in America.

Part I.

The rupture which has recently occurred between the two halves of the North American Union, the northern half with free labor and the southern half with slavery, has attracted the attention of Europe all the more, since the evils resulting from it have already become noticeable and must become ever more acute. Years ago, Charles Dickens wrote, referring solely to England: "Should any misfortune befall the land of cotton, a thousand of the ships of our trading fleet would rot idle in the harbors, ten thousand factories would have to stop their humming looms, and two million people would be laid up." How much greater would the numbers have to be if all world trade were taken into account! And this dangerous prospect of a general trade crisis is getting closer the longer the decision in the United States is delayed. — Under such circumstances, it is natural that the burning question that sparked that civil war should once again become the primary focus of consideration. This time, however, the viewpoint is not taken from an enthusiastic, sentimental perspective, as was the case ten years ago when "Uncle Tom's Cabin" brought tears to all of Europe, but rather the legal question is addressed, or one is even inclined to decide solely on the basis of expediency and one's own interests.

Incidentally, the United States is not the only country in America that has to suffer from the Negro question. For the moment, another empire has been completely forgotten because of the catastrophe there, which otherwise repeatedly occupied the German press over the past decade. It will only take a hint to remind us that Brazil, in its so-called colonization policy, is also primarily concerned with this burning question. The situation here, of course, is different from that in the Union; there is still no talk in Brazil of parties and party struggles for and against Negro slavery; but the number of slaves, and with it the country's labor force, was declining rapidly; attempts were now made to replace them through German immigration, thus giving impetus to the well-known protracted Federkrieg (Feather War).

In the pan-Spanish daughter states on the Central and South American mainland, the black race barely counts and is in any case of no economic or political significance, for the conquerors there mostly already found a settled Indian working population that met their needs. Thus, finally, only in the West Indies can one speak of a Negro question, and here, thanks to the Emancipation Acts, it has now at least been provisionally resolved everywhere. Except in the Spanish possessions, where slavery and the slave trade still continue unabated. And precisely for this reason, the news this spring that Spain had acquired a new possession in the West Indies caused a particular sensation; the question arose: Will Spain respect the existing conditions there? Or will it seek to establish a new colony with slave labor on previously free soil, in the immediate vicinity of a free Negro state?

The question is a very serious one, even if it initially only concerns a relatively small area. For if such an experiment should succeed here, who can guarantee that it will not be tried elsewhere? The days when statesmen and parliaments were guided solely by humanitarian principles in economic matters are over. Certainly, they went too far at that time; the words in the French National Assembly: "Better let the colonies perish than let us be unfaithful to our principles for even a moment!" were presumptuous and sacrilegious. But today, we fear, humanity could easily be put aside. We have seen how the North American planter defends slavery as a divine institution from Holy Scripture; how France, under a transparent mask, attempts to resume the Negro slave trade. And England is not pure either. On the one hand, it has certainly made the greatest efforts to suppress the Negro trade, which, incidentally (to use Palmerston's words), "like every virtue, bears its reward," for through this maritime police force, all the weaker tropical countries are maintained in semi-colonial dependence on the British government. But on the other hand, England invented the trade in East Indian and Chinese wage laborers and still permits it, although no one now doubts that this coolie trade has all the deficiencies and cruelties of the earlier Negro trade, and probably even more.

A calm reflection, however, will grant us the comforting confidence that this danger, a permanent transformation of free land into slavery, is hardly to be feared even in the tropics. On the contrary, even where slavery still exists, it will, in its

natural course, be restricted to ever narrower limits. But the movement, which has been stimulated everywhere, has simultaneously brought to a culmination many old and new, constitutional, political, and international questions, which could potentially bring about a far-reaching upheaval in America; for these, too, we must be prepared.

Let us first consider the events in the West Indies! The West Indies have long since lost their former splendor. In the last century, it was the dream land of all seafaring and trading nations, each striving to establish itself at any price. Fertilized with the capital of all Western Europe, the archipelago, through its exports and wealth, overshadowed the entire American mainland. Then, first, misfortune struck the most prosperous island: the Negro Revolt in the French— Haiti— destroyed production and prosperity there. Then came the abolition of the Negro slave trade, a measure that primarily affected the West Indies, for there, until then, they had relied exclusively on African imports to compensate for the loss of labor. The liberation of the Spanish colonial empires also caused an economic setback, because the newly opened continent attracted the speculation and capital of European merchants and diverted them from the West Indies. Finally, the emancipation of the slaves followed, dealing a severe blow to West Indian production from which it has still not fully recovered. That is a fact; but one should not therefore make unjust accusations against the Negro race. On the one hand, it cannot be denied that the freed slave, previously accustomed to forced labor, is at first usually only too inclined to indulge in unlimited idleness as the first proof of his freedom. However, this is only possible where there is enough wild land on which the freedman can cultivate and obtain the necessities of life; and wise police laws have successfully counteracted this evil. But another difficulty is not so easy to overcome: the freedman will generally have a prejudice against the type of work he previously had to perform as a slave; plantation work bears the stamp of servitude in his eyes, and he therefore prefers any other occupation. Travelers report that the freedmen pushed themselves into much more arduous and dangerous work, while the planters searched in vain for day laborers. This caused the decline of the sugar plantations, which had previously provided the main export of the English West Indies, and if the situation has not become even worse than it actually is, it is probably because the coolie trade was immediately initiated, thus bringing in new labor.

Since then, only the Spanish islands, where slavery and the slave trade continued unabated, especially Cuba, have made material progress; however, it was precisely through their prosperity that they attracted the attention of greedy neighbors. It is recalled how, in the years 1850 and 51, two buccaneer raids were undertaken from North America to conquer Cuba, both of which failed; a third was planned but was not carried out because of the intervention of England and France. Nevertheless, they could not prevent the North Americans from seeking and finding conflict with the Cuban colonial authorities, which then led to lengthy diplomatic reclamations. In the midst of these disputes, the idea arose: the Union should purchase Cuba for cash; but proud Spain refused. For years, Europe watched with rapt attention to how this issue would unfold; in the end, it quietly died down, and the West Indies were virtually forgotten. Only occasionally did they take a romantic interest in the ongoing civil wars and bloody catastrophes on Haiti; little attention was paid to foreign intrigues there. All the more surprising, therefore, was the news that Spain, which a few years ago had barely been able to maintain its possessions, had now taken advantage of the favorable opportunity presented by the North American turmoil and laid its iron hand on the eastern part of the island of Haiti (formerly the Dominican Republic).

That this acquisition, or more correctly reacquisition (revendication), provides great satisfaction to Spanish pride is obvious. Haiti's second name is "Hispaniola," that is, the Spanish island; this was the first point in the New World where the explorer Columbus established a permanent Spanish settlement. In 1496, he built the city of San Domingo, in whose cathedral his remains were laid to rest from 1536 to 1795 (then they were brought to Havana and buried there). In San Domingo resided Columbus and later his descendants as "Admirals of the Ocean and Viceroys (Governors) of India"; here was the royal audience, which initially formed the center of the entire Spanish-American colonial empire; here almost all Spanish conquistadors first unfurled their flags and gathered troops for their daring campaigns of conquest. But this golden age of Hispaniola was short-lived; the island was overshadowed by the wealth of the colonies on the mainland; immigration declined, trade and agriculture stagnated, and the population shrank and sank into poverty. The greater the decline became, the less the Spanish government cared about Hispaniola. Thus, it was possible for bands of foreign settlers and adventurers to establish themselves on the north and west coasts and on the island of La Tortur, and soon a nation of pirates arose here, the so-called buccaneers, who, especially

since the middle of the 17th century, filled all of Spanish America with the terror of their name. France and England favored these wild seafarers for a time; and with their help, as well as with the cooperation of various commercial companies, both powers were the first to gain a firm foothold in the West Indies. Thus, as early as 1670, we find France in actual possession of the smaller western half of Haiti; however, it was not until a hundred years later, through the boundary conventions of 1776-77, that this possession was expressly recognized by Spain, and the dividing line drawn as it still stands today.

The Spanish crown thus retained only the eastern, larger, but less fertile half of the island, and this was probably the poorest and most insignificant of all its colonies. *) The exploitation of precious metals seems to have been exhausted immediately after its discovery; the cultivation of colonial products just covers domestic needs; thus, the national wealth consists only of the semi-wild herds of cattle that cover the vast pastures of the interior, and whose hides, along with salt meat, are exported. It has been so for centuries, and it remains so today. The population is accordingly small; at the end of the last century, it was estimated at 100,000 souls, and it has scarcely increased since then. It consists predominantly of a mixture of European, African, and some Indian blood; more than two-thirds are black, mixed race of various shades. Breeding and pride in skin color are unknown here. From time immemorial, the Black people were equal to whites both legally (according to the old Spanish colonial legislation, the "Code of the Indies") and in public opinion; they liked to call themselves "whites," and no one prevented them from doing so. On the other hand, since there were almost no plantations, there had always been few slaves here; they lived under the roof of their masters as servants and were treated as such. Furthermore, Spanish legislation established far more lenient principles regarding slavery than those of any other nation; it recognized marriages between free and unfree as fully valid; it entitled the slave to redeem himself for a legally determined sum , or, if he had reason to be dissatisfied, to request his sale to another master; it further granted him the unrestricted right to acquire independent property and placed the freedman on an equal footing with the free. The natural consequence was that no sharp contrast could develop here between Whites and Blacks, between slaves and freemen, as happened, for example, in the French and English colonies; a racial struggle or a slave war was impossible here. And so, at the end of the last century, while the French half of the island was devastated by the most terrible revolutions, everything remained quiet in Spanish

Haiti. Soon after, as a result of the temporary French occupation, slavery was completely abolished here as well. And this state of affairs, as it had developed in the peaceful course of history, was finally sanctioned by the constitution of the Dominican Republic in 1844, when it fundamentally declared the permanent abolition of slavery and full equality for all skin colors.

---

*) We will not enter into the history of the western half of the French island here, as it is not politically relevant at present. Suffice it to say that this colony became the most flourishing of all and remained so until the French Revolution; but then the example and the perverse measures of the mother country called forth a struggle between Whites and Blacks, freemen and slaves, from 1790 onwards, which brought about a complete upheaval. In these struggles, the Black general Toussaint Overture finally came to sole power in 1798 and restored a certain amount of order. But then Napoleon attempted reconquest in 1802, which was initially successful; but when there was talk of restoring slavery, a new revolt began, which ended with the expulsion of the French and the complete extermination of the whites in 1804. In the Negro state of Haiti, the Negro Dessalines ruled first as Governor-General, later as Emperor, until 1806. A division then occurred: in the north, the Negro Henry Christopher ruled, first as President, then as King, until 1820; in the south, the Black man Alexander Petion ruled as President until 1818. Petion's successor in the presidency was the Black man Boyer, who reunited both parts and obtained recognition of Haiti's independence from France in 1825. In 1843, Boyer was overthrown and expelled; various rulers quickly followed until, in 1847, the Black General Faustin Soulouque was elected President, who then declared himself Emperor in 1849. The bloody farce of his reign is still fresh in our memory. Finally, on January 15, 1859, he was overthrown and exiled, and since then, the Black General Fabre Geffrard has ruled as President of the Republic for life.

We also refer to the "History of the Island of Haiti," by H. Handelmann , 2nd edition, Kiel, 1860, where the development of both halves of the island up to the year 1855 is described in detail.

As for the political fortunes of the eastern half of Haiti, it remained under the Spanish crown ever since its discovery until it was ceded to France in the Peace of Basel on July 22, 1795. However, it was not until January 1801 that actual possession

was taken, and just eight years later, a combined Anglo-Spanish army forced the French to withdraw (Capitulation of July 6, 1809); Spanish rule was restored. When, however, all the Spanish colonies on the continent shook off the yoke of the mother country, an uprising broke out here as well in December 1821; independence and the republic were proclaimed; however, this led to internal disputes and party struggles. The then ruler of the western half of the island took advantage of this state of confusion; The President of the Negro Republic of Haiti, JP Boyer, marched in with an army, occupied the capital, S. Domingo, on February 9, 1822, and subjugated the entire country. For twenty-two years, the two halves of the island remained united under one rule; however, the differences in nationality and customs between the populations on either side were too stark for a true fusion to have been possible; many governmental missteps were compounded; thus, the descendants of the Spanish colonists endured the imposed incorporation only impatiently. Then, in 1843, President Boyer was overthrown; a constituent assembly proceeded to revise the constitution; fierce party struggles were not lacking, and the representatives of the East, in particular, learned what it meant to be in a natural minority; all their proposals and wishes remained unconsidered. That was the deciding factor; On February 27, 1844, the city of S. Domingo rose up, and within a few days the entire east had joined the uprising; they renounced all ties with the Negro state of Haiti and constituted themselves as an independent, Dominican Republic. The government of Haiti stubbornly refused to recognize this new state; superior Haitian armies were repeatedly sent to subjugate it; first in March 1844, then in July 1845, and finally twice under President, later Emperor Faustin Soulouque , from March to April 1849 and from December 1855 to January 1856; but each time the attackers were repulsed with heavy losses by the brave Dominicans, in which battles the so-called Libertador General , Don Pedro Santana, made a name for himself. Only after the last defeat was a provisional truce for two years agreed in February 1857, and this was extended again for five years in 1859.

But the Dominican Republic had meanwhile cultivated a more dangerous enemy within itself: discord. At the time of liberation, two men played the most prominent roles: the aforementioned General Santana in the field and Don Buenaventura Baez in the cabinet. Both were on friendly terms at that time and remained so for years. First, Santana became President of the Republic, from 1844 to August 1848; then he resigned, and after a brief interregnum, Baez succeeded him, from May 1849 to February 1853, after which Santana assumed the presidency for the second time.

Meanwhile, however, the two men had become enemies, and Santana immediately expelled Baez from the country for good. As a result, the Republic lost its most outstanding organizational talent, and the consequences soon became apparent: the administration stagnated, and the finances declined. Santana himself, now without rivals, became increasingly domineering and violent, but in the end, he probably felt himself that he was not equal to the difficulty of the situation alone. He abdicated in June 1856. Vice President Manuel de Regla Motta then took over the government, and a seeming reconciliation between the two men was successfully initiated, as a result of which Baez returned and ascended the presidency again on October 6, 1856. But the harmony was soon disturbed again; a local uprising took Santana's name as its battle cry, and as a result, Baez exiled the general in January 1857. However, a new, major uprising soon broke out in July 1857; Santana returned, and after a protracted siege of the capital, S. Domingo, Baez was forced to capitulate and leave the country again in June 1858. Meanwhile, the National Assembly had elected another president, but the victorious Santana paid no heed to this; he seized power and exercised it, not without tyranny and persecution, until the most recent events.

One sees that the Dominican Republic had fallen into the same revolutionary turmoil as all the old Spanish daughter states in America; in addition, there was the strained relationship with the Negro state Haiti, who threatened its weak neighbor with far superior power. So it is obvious that this, if anywhere, was favorable terrain for the interference of foreign powers. And however poor and worthless the Dominican Republic may be, it does possess one point which, in other hands, could become of immense importance. This is the Bay of Samana, located at the eastern end of the island, bordered to the north by the mountainous peninsula of the same name, to the west and south by the wide prairie, while to the east a series of sandbanks separates the gulf from the ocean except for a narrow entrance. In its entirety 14 miles long and 4 miles wide, this bay offers the most beautiful anchorage, especially on the north side near the small town of Samana, where the largest squadrons can anchor in complete safety; moreover, the narrow entrance is easy to defend. The bay is thus ideally suited to a landing stage or naval station, and a glance at the map clearly shows the essential advantages it offers for this latter purpose. Just as Havana and Key West command the northern entrance, and Mole S. Nicolas the second, so it commands the third entrance to the Antilles Sea, the Central American Isthmus, and this entrance is the best, for it avoids the dangers of the Gulf Stream and the Bahamian cliffs. Its location alone makes it the military and

commercial center of the entire West Indian chain of islands, from Trinidad up to the tip of Florida, and even the American Gulf, its tributaries, and its shipping could easily be influenced from there. It should therefore come as no surprise that the maritime powers have shown such concern for the fate of the small republic.

The Dominicans, incidentally, also directly requested this assistance. They first turned to France, which had been remembered fondly since its brief reign. Already at the time of the Declaration of Independence in 1844, individual deputies had asked the diplomatic agents for French assistance or even for a French protectorate (suzerainty or sovereignty?); again, during the invasion of Soulouque in 1849, permission to plant the French flag was requested, etc., but out of consideration for England and the United States, these offers were rejected. In return, the English Consul, in turn, offered the Protectorate of Great Britain during the aforementioned invasion on April 18, 1849; however, the National Assembly rejected the proposal. The negotiators of the United States were more fortunate; on October 2, 1854, an agreement was reached on a draft treaty of friendship, trade, and navigation; but the English and French Consuls objected, and another difficulty arose: the National Assembly demanded that Dominican citizens be treated in the United States like citizens of their own country, "without distinction of skin color," something the American government, given the conditions there, could not, of course, accept. Thus, the draft was never finalized, and a second treaty, dated April 8, 1856, was not ratified due to the change of government at that time. Later, after Santana's reinstatement, negotiations were reopened, and the ruler did not seem averse to entering into a closer relationship; however, it seems that the events in the Union since last autumn had made him hesitant and ultimately led him to throw himself into the arms of another power.

Spain had stubbornly asserted its claims since the revolution of 1821, and only by treaty of March 1856 did it recognize the independence of the Dominican Republic. However, it succeeded in inserting a clause that paved the way for its reacquisition. Paragraph 7 permitted natural-born Spanish subjects and their children residing in Dominican territory to reassume their original nationality at will. After that, so to speak, every Dominican could become Spanish again. Paragraphs 8-10 further stipulated that such Dominican Spaniards would be exempt from military service and other public charges. It is difficult to understand how the then President Santana

could make such a concession; he became all the more embittered when he saw the consequences. Thousands of Dominicans immediately registered as Spanish subjects at the Spanish Consulate. Many were attracted by the material advantages of the 8-10, and in any case, given the sad political situation, it was already an advantage to be under foreign protection. Santana now protested and resorted to violent measures; this was followed by Spanish notes and Spanish warships; and probably this very involvement prompted Santana to resign. Then Baez became president again, and since he did not trust Santana's supporters, he considered it expedient to rely on the Spanish party; he even appointed an "enrolled" as minister; thus the confusion grew ever greater, and the enrollments ever more numerous. Finally, the last civil war came, as a result of which Santana regained power. At first, as already mentioned, this once again betrayed an inclination towards North America, and with Spain, as well as with other powers, there were all sorts of disputes; but then his policy changed, and he threw himself completely into Spain's arms. One cannot yet see the matter entirely clearly; but the motives can hardly be doubted. Santana had made more and more enemies through his tyranny; he may have feared another reversal and was therefore looking for foreign help. Now, by the autumn of 1860, things in North America were already such that a rift between North and South was hardly avoidable; therefore, for the time being, there was hope for the future. In the Republic, on the other hand, the Spanish party was growing stronger and stronger, and in the event of a new civil war, it could tip the scales. Thus, the ambitious ruler must have decided to sacrifice the independence of his fatherland in order to buy himself the undisturbed enjoyment of power. Suffice it to say, the negotiations began in Madrid quite secretly; Brilliant promises were made: for Santana, the rank of Spanish Senator and Captain General, for the country, the permanent abolition of slavery, the redemption of devalued paper money at Spanish expense, public buildings, and other benefits. Then, on March 18, 1861, Santana had the Spanish colors planted on the walls of the city of San Domingo and announced to the astonished population the reunification with the motherland. A large portion, especially the foreign merchants, welcomed this event with joy; they hoped that the civil wars were now over forever, and a time of peaceful tranquility and material development would begin. But opposition was also not lacking; entire towns, entire troop detachments protested; Baez returned from exile; he and General Cabral gathered an army within the Haitian borders and advanced into Dominican territory. All, however, in vain. More and more Spanish troops arrived from the West Indian garrisons, and Santana proved his old ruthless energy; the recalcitrant towns were subjugated, not without bloodshed; the Republican army scattered before the

superior force, and Baez and his companions left the island. And according to the latest news, the Republic of Haitian has already had to pay for allowing them to do as they pleased; at the beginning of July, a Spanish squadron appeared before Port-au-Prince and, under threat of bombardment, demanded monetary compensation, the return of the refugees to San Domingo, etc. The Haitian government had to submit; Moreover, it had to withdraw the protest it had raised against the re-incorporation and in which it had reasserted its own claims to Dominican territory.

Thus, Spain has now returned to actual possession of its old colony; for how long remains to be seen. The Dominican population, even if united, is too weak to throw off the yoke; Spain will not allow itself to be taken by surprise again, as in 1821, when it had scattered its power over the entire rebellious continent. The neighboring state of Haiti is also powerless; for as strong as it is in defense, it is just as weak in attack. Of the naval powers, France has given its consent in advance; the Cabinet in Washington, true to the Monroe Doctrine, has protested loudly, and we can be certain that, at least on this point, the Confederation of the Southern States is also completely in agreement; but both can do nothing for the moment; England grumbles and remains silent. And from a general, impartial point of view, it must be admitted that, should a European power ever possess the Dominican territory and the Samana position, this possession will be the safest in Spanish hands. Only one thing should be noted: the seizure of possession took place in agreement with France. Were secret conditions stipulated? It is, as is well known, a favorite idea of Bonapartism to elevate France to the rank of a great naval and colonial power, however little the French people are called to such a role; the first Napoleon attempted the reconquest of Haiti , he intended to establish a great colonial empire in the Mississippi Valley ; the third Napoleon had made inroads in Asia and Africa , and disturbing rumors also spoke of American plans. For now, as long as the Union remains paralyzed, it is the task of British statesmen to monitor these intrigues; a French settlement on Dominican territory would be as much a matter of war for England as the annexation of Sardinia.

How Spanish rule will work here remains to be seen. We will only take a look at one more point, and thus return to the question from which we began. First, a memorandum, adopted at a popular assembly in Kingston, Jamaica (May 24), pointed out that the Spanish seizure of the territory, among other evils, could also

lead to an expansion of the slave trade and slavery in the West Indies. The English Parliament inquired what guarantees Spain had given against this. Now, as already mentioned, Spain promised at the time of the seizure not to reintroduce slavery; but considering how the same Crown keeps, or rather fails to keep, its contractual obligations to abolish the slave trade, such a promise is certainly only a very inadequate guarantee. Meanwhile, we believe we can find better guarantees in the natural conditions of the Dominican Republic. Firstly, the greater part of the land is prairie and has been used for cattle ranching for centuries; This circumstance, and the Spanish practice of thoughtlessly destroying forests everywhere, will probably have rendered most of the land unusable for agriculture for a long time to come. It goes without saying that there are, however, many suitable locations for plantation farming; even in the second Spanish period (1808 to 1821), two large plantations were established in the immediate vicinity of the city of St. Domingo. However, for all the facilities, the operating capital would have to be come from outside; but Spain is not particularly rich and its surplus capital still finds sufficient employment in Cuba; then the immigration of foreign planters, especially English and American Speculators will hardly be permitted by the jealous Spanish government. And to all this comes the following key point. The Dominican population has been described above; the principles of universal freedom and equal rights for all skin colors have been instilled in them throughout history. But no less so, the example of the neighboring state of Haiti has naturally given rise to a very special aversion to the importation of raw African Negroes; and on a small scale, this has been experienced by the Dominicans themselves. For the two plantations just mentioned, 1,500 Africans were imported at one time; in addition, various immigrants from Haiti settled here during Boher's reign. These elements are still alien to the native population and rather sympathize with Haiti, as in 1847 a conspiracy was discovered among them just in time, which aimed at the murder of the whites and the reunification with Haiti. The same thing would be feared with newly imported, raw Negro slaves; and for this very reason, it can be assumed with certainty that the Dominicans would decisively oppose the importation of slaves. For all these reasons, it is highly improbable, if not impossible, that the regained Spanish colony can be transformed, like Cuba, into a flourishing plantation state employing slave labor.

Finally, a word about the western half of the island. Immediately after the revendication of the Dominican Republic, rumors surfaced that the Republic of Haiti would also share the same fate, either voluntarily or by force, and Spain or France

were named as the future overlords. These rumors are completely improbable. Haiti now enjoys complete peace under the administration of President Geffrard and is making decisive progress for the better; there is nothing to fear from the fugitive Emperor Soulouque, who is spending his pensions in Jamaica. And even in party struggles, an ambitious ruler (like Santana) would hardly ever seek foreign protection; for all Black people know very well that they would always play a dubious role in European service, whereas now the highest level of power is within anyone's reach. In general, nothing is further from the minds of the population than the thought of a return to European rule. Distrust of the whites may have been somewhat dulled by the long period of peace, but it is by no means extinguished. One fact guarantees this: since 1804, naturalization and the acquisition of land have been constitutionally prohibited for every white person, and no government, no speaker, or journalist has yet dared to openly challenge this provision. Secretly, some enlightened men may indeed realize that only through European immigration can the missing capital come into the country and further material progress be made possible; however, as already mentioned, they dare not say this publicly. The "uneducated" masses would suspect further plans behind this; they would be worried about their freedom and their landed property, both of which they owe to national independence. Thus, a voluntary subjugation of Haiti belongs to the realm of dreams! And a forced subjugation would present the most enormous difficulties. Apart from the fact that the Negro state has a defense in the jealousy of the maritime powers, its power of resistance is also not to be taken lightly. It would certainly be a small feat for any naval power to devastate, let alone capture, the port cities of Haiti. But the gravity of the state does not lie in the cities; on the contrary, the first constitutions always stated it explicitly: "At the first shot of the siren cannon, the cities disappear and the people rise up." For years, up until French recognition (1825), arson in the cities was militarily organized to counter this disaster, while in the mountains of the interior, inaccessible points were well fortified and equipped with all necessary supplies. The same system of defense would be used now; the enemy would find only heaps of rubble and a desolate coast upon landing; he would not be offered open battle, but in the mountains and forests he would need to seek out the population prepared for a desperate struggle. And the Republic counts, according to the lowest estimate, 500,000, according to the highest, 900,000 inhabitants, which still makes for a considerable military force, even if it is far behind in armament and training. Added to all this is an important ally: yellow fever. Of the expedition Napoleon sent to Haiti and the numerous reinforcements, according to French figures, between May 1802 and November 1803, 14 generals, 1,500 officers ,

20,000 soldiers, and 9,600 sailors, not counting European civilians, fell victim to this plague; thus, despite all his efforts, Napoleon was still unable to maintain a sufficient army on Haiti. The sad outcome of this attempt is a terrible warning for every conqueror eager for conquest.

The Negro Question and the Latest Events in America.

Part II.

After describing the West Indian situation, which was the subject of our first article in the August issue of this journal, we now turn to the South American imperial state.

Brazil has not suffered any major catastrophes for a long time. After initially pulsating wildly with youthful impetuosity for twenty-five years, political life has now been proceeding peacefully for more than a decade and a half in parliamentary proceedings; the standing news is limited to Imperial Diets and Provincial Assemblies, speeches from the throne, committee reports, and ministerial changes. Even greater activity is evident in the area of material interests, for with the emancipation of slaves on the West Indian sugar islands, the central provinces of Pernambuco and Bahia have overtaken them in sugar production, and the coffee of the southern provinces is gaining ever greater importance on the world market; export and import lists are swelling. In addition, the abolition of the slave trade ten years ago drained a considerable amount of capital, which is now seeking new employment: — no wonder, when one constantly hears of new plans and arrangements, of joint-stock companies, public buildings, agricultural colonies, banks, and railways. But in the midst of this pomp and circumstance, from time to time, a loud, feverish cry for "poor people," (braços) that is, for workers, resounds, and reminds us that the foundation of the Brazilian economy must be seriously undermined somewhere. This evil is connected with the Negro question. —

Apart from the fact that Germany, in particular, was destined to have the dubious honor of fertilizing Brazil with its abundance of people and labor, that country also has a peculiar interest for us. Handelmann, in his History of Brazil, characterizes it as "a country whose historical development and structure offer many analogies with our own fatherland; a people in whom, as in the Germans, the contrast between the feeling of universal national solidarity and provincial particularism is evident." And indeed: the dispersion of the Portuguese people over the immense area, the diversity of climate and soil, and the resulting diversity in the way of cultivation and life, as well as the greater or lesser intermingling with African or Indian elements, has produced a diversity of ethnic groups here that could not be greater. In addition, the main provinces have, over time, acquired such a firm character, such a natural independence, that their merging and annihilation would be impossible under a system of unconditional centralization; while, on the other hand, no single province is capable of standing on its own two feet. For all these contradictions, however, the existing imperial constitution, as it emerged from the reform of 1834, has, to all appearances, provided the right solution and reconciliation. And this constitution is particularly interesting because it has successfully attempted to unite the essence of the modern federal state, which otherwise seems possible only in republican form, with the continued existence of a monarchical head. Brazil has thus become a federal monarchy, consisting of independent, semi- republican- governed provinces.

We can only glance briefly at the political history of the empire here. As is well known, Brazil was first discovered and taken possession of by the Portuguese; but other nations also sought to gain a firm foothold here, including the French twice, without success; the Dutch even conquered a whole series of northeastern provinces, but in the Peace of 1661 they were forced to renounce their ties completely. The country then remained under the colonial pressure of the mother country, which was common practice at the time and was enforced all the more strictly here because Brazil had gained a very special value at the end of the seventeenth century through the discovery of rich gold fields. Things only changed when, during the Napoleonic Wars, the Portuguese royal house was forced to flee from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro; only then was Brazil opened to world trade and—in December 1815—elevated to the rank of an independent kingdom. However, when King John VI returned to Lisbon in 1821 following the Portuguese Revolution, the Lisbon Parliament attempted to return Brazil to its old colonial state of dependence and isolation. A rupture occurred. For a moment it seemed as if Brazil would split

into many fragments like the Spanish-American colonial empire; the monarchical principle was also in question; but both dangers were averted when Crown Prince Dom Pedro placed himself at the head of the movement; he proclaimed national independence and had himself proclaimed emperor (7 September and 12 October 1822); Within a short time, the rebellious provinces all gathered around this center, and after a brief reluctance, Portugal too was persuaded by English mediation to recognize the new empire. But the revolutionary era was by no means over; rather, it had truly begun and continued for another twenty years. Wild battles in the Imperial Diet, revolutions in the capital, and numerous uprisings in the provinces alternated with one another. The first emperor was forced to abdicate; the same thing happened to two regents; the current reigning emperor, for his part, was declared of age before the constitutional time, not to mention the countless changes of ministers and other storms. Finally, a state of exhaustion set in; the last rebellion in the extreme southern province was completely quelled by an amnesty at the end of 1844, and since then, the peace of the empire has not been seriously threatened again.

More important from our point of view is the economic history of the country. European immigration in Brazil (as in North America) had to create everything from raw materials, for before the discovery of the country there was no settled agricultural population here, but the native Indians were generally still at the cultural level of hunting, and so the whites found only a vast desert. The population of Portugal, however, is notoriously too small to have been sufficient for a proper settlement of this immense continent, and foreign settlers and immigrants were absolutely not admitted as long as the colonial system existed. In addition, in some regions of Brazil, European immigrants cannot participate in field work without detriment to their life and health; this is particularly true in the deeply incised river valleys and the coastal slopes towards the Atlantic Ocean and from the entire Amazon River basin. Only the temperate south and the interior highlands in the tropics provide for the white farmer. From the outset, other solutions were sought; the native Indians were made slaves wherever possible; Negroes were brought from Africa; thus, slave labor and plantation farming became predominant. And it could not have been otherwise, for the cultivation of sugar, which was originally a staple product throughout the country, can, according to all experience, only be carried out on a large scale; the same is true of cotton, which took second place— as the example of North America and the West Indies shows us, among other things. Of

course, in the last forty years or so, coffee, which was introduced around 1770, has completely overtaken and almost displaced sugar cultivation in the southern provinces, so that it is now considered Brazil's main product in world trade. And with coffee, the situation is essentially different; its cultivation can be profitably carried out even on a small scale; for example, on Haiti, since the emancipation of the Negroes and the fragmentation of landed property, coffee production has increased considerably, while sugar cultivation has ceased altogether. However, in Brazil, conditions had been static for centuries, and the mere partial change of staple products has not been able to change anything; plantation farming with slave labor is still the norm everywhere to this day. Naturally, the same phenomenon is evident here as everywhere in slave and plantation states. Being a planter confers rank; but being a peasant, participating in field work with one's own hands, is considered unworthy of the free and well-born white man; even the freed Negro is hardly willing to undertake this; one prefers any other form of employment. Thus, in Brazil, a proper class of peasants, or (in the American term) "farmers," has never been able to emerge, and the planters were able to appropriate the best and largest portion of the land without rivals. According to a superficial estimate (truly credible statistics do not yet exist), Brazil has a population of about 6 million, half of whom are slaves. Among the free, only 160,000 or even fewer are said to be landowners; likewise, among these, there are only 200,000 slave owners, and of these, most own no more than one or three slaves, so that the bulk of the slave population is probably distributed among only 20,000-40,000 owners: a small aristocracy of property stands in contrast to an overwhelmingly large landless mass.

The freemen's aversion to fieldwork, even where climatic conditions permit it, has drained much of the energy from the work of colonization. Brazil cannot boast such a vanguard of agricultural pioneers as those in North America who are continuously advancing from the long-settled landscapes into the Wild West. As already stated, the freeman who cannot become a planter prefers to seek any other means of livelihood, and if necessity nevertheless compels him to farm, he prefers to stay at home. An unused patch of land can always be found where, with easy effort, he can harvest his own needs through a few weeks' work, and then spend the rest of his time in genteel idleness. Of course, there had always been many of a better breed among these people who were not satisfied by such a life of luxury, and this best element of the people turned to the distant West; but general prejudice held them captive too; the slow but sure profit offered by cultivating the virgin soil was

spurned; instead, they wanted to become rich quickly, so that they could return with the treasures they had gained and enter the planting aristocracy. History shows us how these bold men traded with the Indians or took prisoners among the wild tribes to be sold in the slave markets of the coastal regions, or how they went on a blind hunt for gold and precious stones. Brazil owes the complete discovery and rapid settlement of the interior to these courageous rangers. When the gold districts were discovered there, the population of the long-settled coastal regions streamed westward en masse and spread over the vast expanse in just a few years. Other regions that offered particular advantages for livestock farming also attracted immigrants, albeit in smaller numbers. Thus, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, many new settlements and entire provinces emerged far inland within a few years. But it should be noted that the settlement of the West did not bring about a growth in population and strength, as in North America, but merely a displacement of them. The coastal regions lost a large part of their population, for which the weak Portuguese immigration was unable to compensate; and even less was it able to fill the gaps between those coastal provinces and the newly settled districts of the Far West. And so it has remained to this day; the colonization of Brazil is still only a sketch, awaiting further development and completion. "Our fatherland," an imperial minister told the Reichstag a few years ago, "is a country of immense size, where the population is scattered into groups that are, moreover, separated from one another in many places by great distances and the worst roads, where it is therefore very difficult to establish the necessary education to convince the inhabitants of their true interests , where the arm of the authorities can only reach everywhere with difficulty, even to bring swift assistance to the subjects where they need it, or to use coercive measures against those who do not want to submit to government measures for the common good."

To complement the above remarks, let us take a look at production and export conditions. For world trade, only the coastal provinces can be considered agricultural. Rio de Janeiro and its surroundings supply coffee, Pernambuco and Bahia, along with their surroundings, produce sugar and cotton, and Maranhas, cotton. From the Amazon river basin of Para, almost exclusively come products of the jungle, rubber, timber, etc.; from Rio Grande do Sul, livestock products such as hides and horns; from the interior, the same comes, along with mineral products, gold dust, diamonds, etc. The first three staple products, however, account for more

than 1/3 of the total value of exports; thus, Brazil's national wealth is based on agriculture.

The actual labor force with which agriculture was carried out, as already mentioned, always consisted of slaves, drawn from two races: the native Indian and the African. The very first colonists brought Negro slaves with them or had them brought after them; these were generally preferred because of their greater physical strength and stamina; but they were relatively expensive due to the long transport distances. It was cheaper to acquire Indian slaves from the immediate vicinity; they were captured from the local tribes in occasional wars, or they were bought, or they even went out on a manhunt. Thus, in the first centuries, the slave population consisted predominantly of Indians. But in this activity, the planters soon found adversaries in the Society of Jesus. It is well known what a magnificent missionary activity this order developed among the native peoples of the New World, in which many German brothers also played a prominent role. The wild tribes were baptized and settled together in larger communities (missions), where, under the patriarchal rule of a missionary, they became accustomed to a settled, agricultural life and attained a certain semi-culture; as in Paraguay, California, and here as well. Naturally, under such circumstances, conflict between missionaries and colonists was inevitable. The planters were dissatisfied that the Jesuits, through their conversions, were depriving them of the native human booty; the Jesuits complained that the planters, through their manhunts, were making the Indians suspicious and hostile, thus disrupting the missionary work. The Order appealed to the Portuguese government for protection and asked that the freedom of the Indian race be guaranteed. Naturally, the planters replied that if they were forbidden the use and acquisition of Indian slaves, the plantations and the entire production of the country would perish. This fundamental dispute over the question of what position the native race should assume in Brazilian state and national life is most aptly called the Indian Question. It flared up around 1550 and continued for two hundred years, giving rise to countless disputes, unrest, and rebellions. The worst of it was that the government did not maintain a fixed system, but wavered back and forth, making concessions now to the missionaries, now to the planters, so that the legal situation was constantly changing and partisan fury was constantly aroused.

The outcome varied in different parts of the country; in the central coastal provinces, Pernambuco, Bahia, and the Caribbean, the Indian question faded into the background early on, as it was easiest to procure Negroes from Africa there. In the south, the laws remained ineffective; from St. Paulo, ever-new raiding parties set out on manhunts; missions in the way were forcibly destroyed, or the missionaries voluntarily abandoned them to seek refuge with their baptized children in Spanish territory. Then the entire hinterland was plundered to supply the slave markets of Rio and St. Paulo. These raids only ceased around 1700 when the discovery of gold opened up a more convenient source of income for the rangers; but by then, the native population throughout the interior of central and southern Brazil had already been terribly weakened and, in some places, completely exterminated. Since then, the Indian blood has been almost completely erased from the mixture with the European and African blood, both among the slave and the free population.

Things were different in the north, in the provinces along the Amazon River. There, after long disputes, a kind of compromise was reached, according to which the missionaries could work undisturbed, but every Indian belonging to the missions was obliged to work for the planters for six months a year in return for a legally fixed wage. In the end, the Portuguese minister Pombal, known for his bold reforms, abolished Indian slavery completely and without exception by law on June 6, 1755. However, the compulsory six-month labor continued for about fifty years, until King John VI abolished this too. Since then, the Indians have been completely free and equal in name and before the law. On the other hand, the Indians were removed from spiritual care; Marquis Pombal expelled the missionaries and placed the missions under the direction of secular directors, who on the whole managed them poorly. King John VI also abolished the directors, so that the semi-civilized tribes were left to fend for themselves. The result was that the missions almost completely fell into disuse; some tribes returned to the barbaric way of life of their ancestors, others moved to the vicinity of Brazilian towns, where they could earn their living with easy labor. Today, the situation here in the north is as follows: the Indians still constitute the bulk of the total population ; of these, only a few tribes remain completely wild here (as in the rest of Brazil), living far inland or in particularly remote areas; the rest are in constant contact with the whites and live in the outward appearance of Catholicism , in a semi-civilized state, an ignorant and poor, lazy, and indolent people. Nevertheless, they more or less fill the place of the working tribes; they gather and process the products of the jungle for export, they

serve as hunters, fishermen, and boatmen. But they are just as reluctant to engage in actual fieldwork as any other free people. The few plantations here, as everywhere else, are cultivated by Negro slaves.

Black slavery in Brazil does not have such a turbulent history, and there has never been any talk of a Black question in the usual sense. The African slave trade and the servitude of Black people were taken for granted, a fact that was neither thought about nor reasoned about. Certainly, individual Portuguese men had already challenged the slave trade in the past, for example, around 1569, a clergyman named Thomas de Mercado, a hundred years later, a preacher named Antonio Vieyra of the Society of Jesus, and in particular, in 1758, Father Manuel de Ribeiro Rocha, who in his book, " Ethiopia resgatada" [1]) demanded the abolition of slavery in general and, in particular, wanted the punishment of piracy to be applied against the slave trade. However, these voices remained isolated, and as late as 1808, the then Bishop of Pernambuco, probably influenced by the events at Haiti, wrote a treatise "On the Justice of the Slave Trade." Here, as in many places, it was English policy that first seriously encouraged the abolition of the slave trade; in the various treaties of friendship and trade concluded with England in 1810, 1815, 1817, and 1826, the Brazilian government was required to first condemn the human trafficking in principle, then to restrict it in practice, and finally to commit itself to its complete abolition. And in fact, by an imperial decree of March 13, 1830, the slave trade was completely prohibited. However, the law remained a dead letter for the time being; the African imports continued unchanged, and England turned a blind eye, for it had very important commercial interests to protect; after all, through those treaties, English trade was particularly favored and practically held a monopoly. But then, in 1844, Brazil changed its customs system, and the new tariff made all flags completely equal; the previous reason for leniency thus ceased. England ruthlessly pressed for the fulfillment of its old promises, and when there was resistance in Rio, the London Cabinet resorted to energetic measures, which, of course, can hardly be justified under international law. The so-called Aberdeen Bill of August 8, 1845, authorized English cruisers to pursue any suspicious vessel, not only on the open sea, but also along the coasts, in the rivers and bays of Brazil, and, if necessary, to search for escaped slaves even on the mainland. Brazilian slave traders were to be tried like pirates by English Admiralty courts. The solemn protest lodged by the Cabinet of Rio against this violation went unheeded; more importantly, the English courts made difficulties against the act, and so it remained without practical success. In any case,

it was a blunt warning. The result was that a few years later, partly through the personal influence of the Emperor, a new law was passed in the Brazilian Reichstag, which repeated the previous prohibition in a stricter form and equated the slave trade with the crime of piracy, September 4, 1850. This law was then seriously implemented, and although isolated contraventions may still have occurred, on the whole the importation of Negroes has come to an end.

---

1) “Etíope Resgatado, Empenhado, Sustentado, Corrigido, Instruído e Libertado” (Ethiopian Redeemed, Committed, Sustained, Corrected, Instructed, and Delivered) by Manuel Ribeiro Rocha.

A severe blow for Brazilian agriculture! Such a possibility had never been seriously considered before, and now they suddenly found themselves in a dire straits. Just as the planter in the West Indies, and even today in Cuba, so the Brazilian planter had always preferred to buy fully grown male slaves from whom they could derive immediate benefits. Women were less sought after and imported in fewer quantities. This created a severe sex imbalance, as a result of which natural reproduction was insufficient to cover the natural decline. In North America, a distinction is known to be made between slave -breeding and slave- consuming states; the surplus of the former compensates for the deficit of the latter. Brazil, on the other hand, was a complete slave-consuming nation, and so it was forced and accustomed to supplementing its needs from African imports. This supply suddenly ceased entirely in 1850; The result was that the existing slave population was barely sufficient for the moment, all the more so since production had increased significantly due to the brisk demand. But it could be even less sufficient for the future, for, in the natural course of events, the number would continue to decline for years to come. And now a special misfortune occurred: it is recalled how, in the last decade, cholera and yellow fever repeatedly wreaked terrible devastation along the entire coastal stretch—the most terrible, understandably, among the poorly fed and poorly clothed slave population. Thus, the loss of slaves, and thus of labor, soon became extremely significant; the price of slaves rose fourfold and even more within a few years. The increase in wages, of course, was generally proportional. Many foreign observers may have believed that precisely this increase in wages would

influence the free population and awaken the desire for profit and work among the poorer classes. In this way, at least a partial replacement for the loss of labor would have been found. However, such a calculation was erroneous; the free Brazilian is frugal and prefers to live in poverty in lazy independence rather than in laborious prosperity; moreover, the prejudice against field labor is too deeply rooted.

For the moment, the planters have helped themselves as best they could. Admittedly, not without detriment to the community. High prices—that's one thing—induce small proprietors to sell their slaves to the large planters. But now, the planters work solely for export; food crops are grown on the plantations only for their own needs, and their cultivation is neglected the more the higher the prices of staple products rise; for the planter then considers it more advantageous, from his point of view, to buy food than to produce it himself. The situation is similar in the North American planter states; however, their demand is certainly met by supplies from the free northern states. In Brazil, the situation is different: here it was primarily the small Negro proprietors who usually supplied the first foodstuffs; the more their numbers dwindle, the more production in this field declines. The prices of the most essential foodstuffs are already disproportionately high, and as early as 1858, a reduction in import duties on flour, fish, and meat was proposed in the Reichstag, and from some provinces, complaints have even been heard that famine is imminent.

And secondly, in the central coastal provinces, especially in the coffee-growing areas around Rio de Janeiro, where production is much more active than in the rest of the empire, the demand and thus the price of slaves is naturally higher. This gives rise to speculation; especially in the northern provinces, the slaves are bought up and exported south; even the province of Bahia suffers from this; therefore, attempts were made here to make slave export more difficult by imposing an export duty of 100 milrei (70-80 thalers) per capita by provincial law; but this has had little effect; we know, for example, that in spite of this, in 1854 1835 slaves were exported south from Bahia, 1692 of them to Rio de Janeiro. — It is obvious that this type of internal slave trade is unnatural and also violates the laws of sound economics. For here the Negro is seduced from the hotter to the more temperate zone; the slave comes from the regions of cotton and sugar, in whose cultivation he seems almost indispensable, to the region of coffee, whose production is just as possible with free

labor. It is the direct counterpart to the rational inland slave trade of North America. Moreover, the inland slave trade here is not, as in North America, carried on with the surplus of the local slave industry, but is a mere shifting of the slave population. While this maintains the necessary labor force in the central provinces, despite the natural decline, in the other provinces the number of slaves must shrink all the more quickly and economic decline be accelerated. It therefore means nothing other than that the temporary continuation of the production and prosperity of some provinces is based on the even more rapid ruin of others!

This is the current state of the Negro question in Brazil. One sees that it is exclusively economic in nature, not, as elsewhere, a question of politics or racial antagonism. Abolitionist agitation has never existed here, and under current conditions, it is doubly impossible; there is also no antagonism between free and slave states; rather, the institution is common to the entire empire. Only from outside has the suggestion been repeatedly made that one should proceed toward the abolition of slavery in the southern provinces, which are suitable for the immigration of European farmers; however, this well-intentioned advice has so far fallen on deaf ears. Furthermore, that sharp racial antagonism, such as exists, for example, in North America between whites on the one hand, and free Black people and Negro slaves on the other, does not exist in Brazil. Never, neither before nor after independence, has legislation differentiated between free people in terms of rights and duties based on skin color. As early as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, we find individual Negroes and Indians decorated with Portuguese honorary titles and high decorations, and every office and every career in state and church has always been equally accessible to free Black people and white people. Of course, it is obvious that this concession cannot eliminate the actual material and intellectual predominance of the white race: the aristocracy of property and office, even though there are many mixed-race people among them, still consists predominantly of white people. The same applies to social life: Black people will, as a rule, not push themselves close to white people, but where free people of different races meet, each treats the other as their equal, and it never occurs to the mulatto to voluntarily submit to the white person, or to the white person to clearly elevate themselves above the Black person. Thus, the worst factor that otherwise poisons conditions in slave states is missing here. As for slavery itself, the legislation leaves much to be desired in this regard; But the practice seems to be mild on the whole. From this point of view, there is no particular cause for concern in Brazil. Far more

threatening is the above-mentioned contrast between the small property-owning aristocracy and the large propertyless masses, and the danger of this has already been demonstrated in isolated local riots, where the poor rabble, regardless of color or burden, demanded that practical communism be enacted.

But as far as the Negro question is concerned, one thing is clear: Brazil's existing plantation economy is headed for ruin if it fails to find a replacement workforce for the loss of slaves. The simplest means, and certainly the most desirable for the planters, would be the resumption of the African slave trade—but fortunately, this means is barred. England threatened to revive the Aberdeen Bill several years ago because of a minor incident! First of all, there is the means by which the West Indies helped themselves after the emancipation of slaves —the importation of Asian wage laborers from China and India. Indeed, individual attempts have already been made with this; however, the transport costs are too high given the great distance, and even in this case (at least with regard to the Indian coolies) one comes under the unpleasant control of England. Therefore, the only option is to seek help from European, and especially from German, emigration.

We are now touching on a chapter which has already been discussed in detail in this journal, *) and can therefore restrict ourselves to a few hints.

---

*) Compare the second article on German emigration in the November 1858 issue.

Two trends exist side by side regarding European immigration to Brazil. Since the abolition of colonialism, it has been a hobby of the imperial government to summon foreign settlers and disperse them in individual, closed groups, so-called colonies, throughout the various provinces; these were intended to serve as model economies for the native population. Later, the provincial governments made similar attempts, and individual private entrepreneurs or joint-stock companies also established colonies, usually receiving support from the public treasury. It is well known, and

explained in the cited article, how great the costs and abuses of these endeavors have been, and how limited the success has been; such artificial immigration could in fact be of little benefit to the country. To truly develop a new country, it requires large-scale, spontaneous immigration, such as North America attracts; the government finally realized this. The prerequisite for this, however, is that the immigrant be made able to acquire his own land with ease and at a reasonable price; the government itself, through its land offices, must offer such small plots for sale. Until now, however, Brazil lacked any regulated land system; the public lands were neither demarcated nor surveyed; such unprecedented confusion prevailed that, for example, in Santa Catarina, a colony once received a gift of wasteland from the government, and yet the colonists later had to buy the same land again because private individuals could prove older ownership rights. To put an end to this confusion, the government ordered the segregation, surveying, and sale of state lands by law of September 18, 1850, and by regulation of January 30, 1854. It was at least a first step, but by no means everything, because before one could truly recommend emigration to Brazil with a clear conscience, many other concessions and reforms would have been necessary.

But even the little that has been done has been called into question by opposing elements. From the very beginning, the native population was not particularly favorable to foreign immigration; when the first land donations for colonies were made, voices were raised: "If the government wanted to give away land, there would be enough Brazilians who would take it; no foreigners would be needed for that." Gradually, people have become more accustomed to this; but only in the extreme southern provinces of Rio Grande do Sul, São Catarina, and Parana is foreign immigration somewhat popular. In the central provinces, the planters here are decidedly opposed to free immigration, for it would inevitably create a class of small landowners, which could pose unpleasant competition for them, especially in coffee production. For this reason alone, they do not approve of the law on public lands—and for a second reason as well. The planter aristocracy, which owns the largest and best portion of the land, has truly legitimate titles to only the smallest part of it; by far the majority belongs to it only by virtue of actual possession; it must therefore fear that a large portion of its holdings will be taken away from it again if the public lands are properly seized. For both reasons, the planters had vigorously opposed the draft of that law in the Reichstag for many years; when it finally passed in 1850, they did not rest until they had implemented the regulations of 1854, which significantly

weakened the effectiveness of the law. But even that did not satisfy them; they placed every possible obstacle in the way of its implementation, so that to this day it has produced virtually no results; the land system is still as bad as ever. In short: the planter aristocracy does not want voluntary immigration, no immigration of free peasants, and since it has the upper hand in the Reichstag and in all public life, the government, even with the best will in the world, would be powerless to prevent it. But goodwill and energy are also lacking in government circles; in order to maintain their position, the ministers make one concession after another to the planters and, against their better judgment, submit to their selfish wishes.

What the planters desire is certainly also European immigration, but a different kind of immigration, one that would provide them with dependent tenants and day laborers (to compensate for the loss of slaves). Senator Vergueiro was the first to put this desire into practice by inventing the so-called parceria (sharecropping); in 1847, he brought workers from Germany at his own expense and allocated them specific plots on his coffee plantations in St. Paulo, under the contractual condition that half the amount would accrue to him as the landlord, and the other half to the colonists for the work, and that the colonist would then use the remaining half to repay the lord for the expenses of transport and initial provisions. Until the debt was paid, the colonist remained tied to the land, like a serf. *) This system received widespread approval from the planting aristocracy, and now recruitment began, especially in Germany and Switzerland. At first, the recruitment was the private concern of individual planters, who, however, were supported by public funds; later, a kind of centralization took place, with the formation of a large Central Company for Colonization in 1856. This company was, in a sense, transformed into a state institution in 1858, and the government has since then fully identified with the system, as a minister declared in the Brazilian Diet just a few weeks ago: "The government will continue to vigorously support the Parceria colonization, pay bounties for every immigrant brought in, and will especially be concerned with making the colonists available to the landowners for coffee picking." It was mentioned on the same occasion that in the last six to seven years, 12,000 or even 18,000 immigrants had been lured to Brazil.

---

*) These contracts were tacitly supplemented by the Brazilian Servants' Law of 1837, which threatened servants who received advance payments with heavy fines and imprisonment. Many colonists were sentenced under this law. Recently, however, a judge ruled: "The Parceria contracts are merely association contracts, and therefore that law does not apply to them." See Spener'sche Zeitung of September 11, 1861.

The number is too small to be of any particular benefit to Brazil's economy, but far too large when one considers the extent of the misery that has affected these colonists and still awaits them. It is superfluous to provide details; anyone seeking them will find plenty in the daily press and pamphlets of recent years. Moreover, apart from a few paid advocates, the condemnation of the parcerist and day laborer recruitment campaigns has long been unanimous, and there is a general sense of how much the honor of the German name in South America suffers from the fact that Germany has so long allowed itself to be a human market for Brazilian planters. The measures of the Prussian government in this field have therefore been greeted with general applause; admittedly, only the most basic measures have been taken so far.

The Negro question and the latest events in America.

Part III.

The present catastrophe in the United States of North America has strangely confused the judgment of public opinion. It was not long ago that the great transatlantic republic was regarded by European liberalism as the unsurpassable model state, whose splendour and prosperity rested on unshakable foundations; it seemed incredible that the growth of the "young giant" would ever be checked, and the word of "manifest destiny" to ever wider annexations found as many believers on this side of the ocean as on the other. Now we see the Union torn apart, perhaps forever, by a bloody civil war; the government at Washington, which until recently always interpreted the so-called Monroe Doctrine palatably, must look on with impotent resentment as Spain revindicates the Dominican Republic, and as even Mexico is threatened with military pacification by three European powers; the renegade southerners, who otherwise only dreamed of conquests and annexations, must now beg for foreign intervention or even protection. In North America civil liberty, the free movement of the individual, seemed to be protected and guaranteed as nowhere else; and now not only blind party fury exercises the worst tyranny there, but the authorities also resort to the obsolete police measures of Europe and to even worse arbitrariness. The eminently practical people extolled the administration of the Union as the ideal of prosperity; on the contrary, the last few years have brought to light the worst squandering and corruption, and the present armaments, imprudently directed, heap loan upon loan, debt upon debt. In short, it has become clear to everyone that the whole much vaunted state organization cannot withstand such tremendous shocks, any more than any other elsewhere. - But not only superficial observers, but also well-informed connoisseurs of American conditions have been surprised by the outbreak of the Civil War. How many times has it not been demonstrated in the most apparent manner that a division of the Union over the slavery question was improbable, because so many other all too important interests incessantly tied the two halves to each other! The success shows that man had reckoned too much on reason and too little on passions.

Now and then a certain feeling of satisfaction mingles with the general astonishment; the unbridled self-confidence, the bold arrogance of the North Americans has often offended, and one therefore more or less grants them the

present humiliation. The sympathies of Germany will, nevertheless, not go astray. It is the open ground of the northern states of the Union where countless of our compatriots have made a new home for themselves; many thousands of threads of kinship and friendship are spun between here and there across the ocean of the world. And in the party as well as in the army, which defends the constitution and the territorial unity of the Union, the Germans play an outstanding role. The sympathies will be even stronger if the circumstances are properly appreciated. In North America, too, a relatively "small but powerful party," the aristocracy of the slaveholders, had for ten years seized power and abused it in the worst manner; the government at Washington was only its organ, and with the public funds it bought a large following. But in silence the opposing party gathered strength, and in the presidential election of 1860 it won the victory; thus a new era was to begin with the appointment of the new President Abraham Lincoln. The slaveholders realized that the end of their rule had come: - so they proclaimed the separation of the slave states from the Union and ignited the Civil War. -

If the slavery question has thus at least provided the impetus and the slogan for the present struggle, we must, in order to arrive at a correct understanding, first consider it in its historical development. -

Slavery in America is as old as the settlement of white people; when the English first settled in the present territory of the United States, the institution had long existed throughout the Spanish and Portuguese colonial empires, just as the majority of the rural population in Europe was still languishing in hard serfdom. At that time, therefore, neither slave ownership nor the slave trade bore the hallmark of hatefulness with which the growing humanity of later centuries branded them. Nor was slavery originally confined to the Negro alone, as it is now: in addition to the black slaves supplied by the African supply, Indians who were prisoners of war were also held, and white slaves were also kept in bondage. Various elements were mixed among the latter: On the one hand, England deported certain criminals to America until 1776, where they were sold to the colonists for service for certain years; in America itself, the sale into temporary servitude was lawful for certain crimes, instead of imprisonment or public penal servitude; finally, English and Dutch rulers used to transport poor emigrants who could not pay the costs of the voyage to America on speculation, and these then had to be sold to some employer for the transportation costs for a contractually determined time and thus redeem themselves by their own labour, from which they received the name redemptiorers. The number of Indian slaves has always been relatively small, and they have

generally mixed almost completely with the Negroes; on the other hand, white slavery has declined considerably since the regular supply was interrupted by the protracted revolutionary wars, and it finally ceased altogether when Congress prohibited all indentured service for transportation costs at the beginning of this century. Since then, the curse of slavery has weighed only on the Negro and the half-breed of African blood.

There were Negro slaves in all North American territories during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and more and more were brought into the country from Africa through a regular supply provided by the rivers of Liverpool and Bristol in particular, as well as those of New England. Incidentally, individual voices were raised against this early on, and here and there attempts were made to restrict the slave trade or even slavery by law; the Quakers and the German Moravians in particular were tireless in these efforts, but without any particular success. And in general, it can be said that until the Revolution, American public opinion remained completely indifferent to this institution. It was only during the political storms which preceded the war of liberty that things gradually changed; at first the Americans were able to base their opposition to the English Parliament on law and custom, but as time went on they abandoned this ground and relied on natural law, on those liberal theories which had then become common property through French philosophy; the Declaration of Independence laid down the principle "that all men are created equal, and endowed with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Should this gospel apply only to white men? Some, at least the best men, were of the opinion that "it would be inconsistent, while fighting for one's own liberty, to deprive other people of it." From then on, the abolitionist movement aimed at the abolition of the slave trade and slavery.

The new state of Vermont, which had just been formed, set a good example and abolished slavery by constitution in 1777; the same happened in Massachusetts, Maine and Pennsylvania in 1780, in New Hampshire in 1783, in Rhode Island and Connecticut in 1784. In addition, all states, except the Carolinas and Georgia, prohibited the African slave trade in 1778-84 after a congressional act of 1776. Furthermore, the so-called Anti-Slavery Proviso of the Ordinance of July 13, 1787 banned all slavery in the so-called Northwest Territory between Ohio and Mississippi, where five new states (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin) have since emerged. Then New York abolished slavery in 1799 and New Jersey in 1804, and finally, on February 26, 1807, a congressional act was passed which banned all

African and overseas slave trade, slave transportation and slave importation in perpetuity throughout the territory of the Union. With this the actual historical significance of the abolitionist movement ceased; the abolition societies have continued their agitation since then, sometimes with greater, sometimes with less zeal, but they have no longer achieved any real success.

Thus, only the northern states made the sacrifice to the principles of humanity and abolished slavery, not the southern states. One should therefore neither praise the one too much nor blame the other too much. For the North, the sacrifice was relatively small; according to the census of 1800, New York had 20,000 slaves, or only 3 percent, and New Jersey 12,000, or only 6 percent of the total population; in the other northern states around the time of abolition, the number and ratio was even smaller. It was different in the southern states. According to the census of 1790, Virginia had 293,000 slaves, or 38 percent of the total population, Maryland 103,000, or 32 percent, North Carolina 100,000, or 26 percent, South Carolina 107,000, or 43 percent, and Georgia 29,000, or 35 percent, and these ratios had remained almost unchanged in the census of 1800, while the numbers had grown significantly. It is natural that people here shrank from the sacrifice, and one might doubt whether tobacco growing in Virginia, or even rice growing in the unhealthy coastal marshes of South Carolina and Georgia, could be just as easily and profitably maintained without slaves. In fact, we see that the South was already emphasizing and maintaining its material interests over all humane theories around this time. In the Convention of 1787, where the Federal Constitution was debated, both the Carolinas and Georgia resolutely made it a condition, that for the time being the African slave trade be permitted to them for twenty years, — which was indeed done; likewise, the South enforced that the extradition of fugitive slaves be secured to it by a special article of the Constitution, for the execution of which Congress enacted a special extradition law in 1793. And when, in 1790, Congress considered a petition from the Abolition Society for the complete abolition of slavery, a Southerner threatened (for the first time!) to dissolve the Union again; to reassure the South, it was then expressly decided "that Congress had no right to interfere in the slavery relations of the individual states." Slavery was thus recognized as a peculiar institution of some states, outside the competence of federal legislation.

But it was not enough for the southern states to maintain the institution of slavery within their borders: they wanted just as much as the free north to retain a hinterland which the slaveholders could colonize in their own way, i.e. with slave labour. And they did indeed obtain, partly by treaty, that slavery remained

permitted in the area south of the Ohio; thus, the states of Kentucky, Tenessee, Alabama and Mississippi later became slave states. In the same direction, the South soon acquired the western Mississippi Valley, which Napoleon sold to the Union in 1803. There, upon taking possession, a district at the mouth of the Mississippi was already found, with sugar cultivation and slave labour, the later state of Louisiana, and this joined the slave states fraternally. In view of this, a petition by the abolitionists, which in 1804 requested a ban on slavery in the entire newly acquired territory, was ignored by Congress. Similarly, the next acquisition, the purchase of Florida in 1819, worked to the advantage of the South; given its location and nature, this peninsula was bound to fall within the circle of slave states, and there was all the less to be said against this since slavery had existed here since time immemorial.

At that time, in 1819, the Union thus numbered 22 states, including 11 free states (New Hampshire, Massachusetts with Maine, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois) and 11 slave states (Delaware, Virginia, Maryland, both Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tenessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama); In addition, the territory of Michigan and Wisconsin was legally and factually reserved for the free states, while the Florida peninsula was reserved for the slave states. It had not yet been decided which group the newly settled territories of Missouri and Arkansas would belong to. Thus, despite abolitionism, slavery had made almost greater progress in terms of space than free labour; even in terms of population, the two halves of the Union were almost as equal as they had been thirty years earlier. According to the census of 1790, the total population of the Union had amounted to a little under 4 million, of which the North and South had almost equal numbers; according to the census of 1820, however, it was over 9 million, of which the free states had a little over 5 million, the slave states a little under 3 million and 1 1/2 million slaves.

Such a result was contrary to all expectations, for at the beginning of this period it had seemed as if slavery would die out by itself as unprofitable and unproductive. For the staple products of the slave states at that time had only poor prospects; in the more northern regions (Maryland, Virginia 2c.) tobacco was regarded as such, and in the more southern (South Carolina, Georgia 2c.) rice and indigo. Now experience in Europe and America has proved that tobacco cultivation can be carried on as advantageously with free labour as with slavery; in fact, the tobacco planters in the immediate vicinity saw themselves threatened by the competition of the farmers, and the danger was all the greater because the old established plantations were exhausted by overexploitation, while the farmers settled on fresh land. On the

other hand, as far as rice and indigo were concerned, the American planters in the English East Indies had a superior competitor who could produce cheaper and more; naturally, they had to be excluded from foreign markets as a result, and so an upswing in this production was out of the question. While the sources of income flowed more sparingly, the planters still suffered from the aftermath of the war, in particular from an oppressive burden of debt. In short, it seemed as if the southern states were heading for economic ruin; the value of the plantations and the number of slaves was falling; indeed, for some planters their slaves were almost a burden, a highly unprofitable capital investment. Suddenly, however, there was a turnaround; - a new staple product was found for the South, which employed its planters and slaves in a rewarding way and was capable of the greatest upswing.

Cotton was first cultivated in North America in Virginia in 1621 and prospered well at that time; however, production remained low and probably soon ceased, as this state lies outside the actual cotton zone, the northern border of which is approximately Latidude 35°. This much at least is certain, that in New England, where cotton spinning began in 1643, the raw material was obtained from Barbadoes. It was not until the next century that the cotton plant was reintroduced from the West Indies to the American continent, but initially it was only kept as an ornamental plant. From 1763 onwards, however, spinning machines were invented in England, on which the modern cotton industry is based: this increased the demand for raw material, and this had an effect back on America. In 1775, the legislature of South Carolina recommended cotton to the planters, and small quantities were indeed exported as early as 1784. On the whole, however, it was so little and so new that ten years later, in 1794, the American envoy in London, J. Jay, declared during negotiations on a trade treaty: "he was not aware of any export of cotton from the Union." Up to now, only one variety, the long-fibered cotton (Sea Island Cotton, Gossypium arboreum), had been grown and exported, and although this is the best in terms of quality and price, its natural range is very limited, as it only thrives in full quality on the coastal islands and the swampy lowlands of South Carolina and Georgia and individually in Florida, which is why then as in today it only supplied about tenth of the total production. However, a second variety was known, the short-fibered cotton (Upland Cotton, Gossypium herbaceum), and it is this that is now grown throughout the entire cotton zone; at that time, however, its cultivation was not very advantageous. The seed of this variety is so firmly attached to the wool that, if it is to be separated by hand, at most one pound a day can be cleaned; the production costs were therefore too high. But then, in 1793, a poor labourer from Massachusetts, Eli Whitney, invented the cotton gin in Georgia, a machine that could

easily clean a thousand pounds of seed in one day. Since then, the cotton industry has boomed; in 1793 the total export amounted to only 187,000 pounds, in 1794 already 1,601,761, in 1795 over 6 million, in 1805-7 an average of 46 million, in 1815 82 million and in 1821-23 an average of 148 million pounds. Now the United States supplies about 1000 million annually, while the rest of the world's production is estimated at only 400 million pounds. As production increased, the price naturally fell: a pound of cotton cost on average 30 - 40 cents in 1790, only 17 - 19 in 1800, and now about 7 cents; to the same extent, the spinning mills were able to produce more cheaply and the consumption of cotton goods increased, which in turn naturally stimulated cotton production.

When Whitney filed a lawsuit to uphold his patent in 1807, Judge Johnson characterized the turnaround caused by the Cotton Gin in his speech to the jury as follows: "The whole interior of the Southern States was hastening towards its ruin; their inhabitants were emigrating because they could not utilize their labour at home. Then the invention of Whitney's machine opened prospects, as by a stroke of magic, which set the whole country in motion and useful activity. Our debts were paid, our fortunes increased, and our lands trebled in value." But the latter also applies to the slaves; now that there was enough rewarding work, they became a highly valuable possession, of which one could never have enough; for example, in South Carolina alone, about 40,000 African regents were still cloistered from 1803-1807. And indeed, the states of the cotton zone could not do without such an increase in labour, since the natural increase in their own slave population was not sufficient for the ever-increasing demand and production. But then came the law of 1807, which banned the African slave trade; the cotton planters now had to look for a substitute elsewhere - and they found one in the immediate vicinity. The planters of the northern slave states had not been as fortunate as their southern brethren; here, unlike there, there was no staple product for which the competition of free labour would have been excluded, nor did the climate prohibit the white farmer from competing with the Negroes. Thus, the stock of slaves was continually greater than the demand, and nothing could be more convenient to the planter than to gain a market in the South for this surplus, a market on which he had a monopoly when the African supply was excluded. Since then, slaves have become a valuable commodity here, planters have taken up Negro breeding, and a regular domestic slave trade has developed between the slave-breeding states and the slave-consuming states in the cotton and sugar zone.

One can see the result of the interaction of the Cotton Gin and the law of 1807: the Negro slave increased significantly in value, in the southern states as labour, in the middle states as a commodity. If at the end of the eighteenth century the slaveholders in these regions had already shrunk from abolishing slavery at the depressed prices, how much more so now with rising prices and increasing demand? It was natural that they should become more and more sensitive to the idea of abolition. Incidentally, the abolitionist movement itself was dying out; apart from a small tribe of radicals, the impracticability was becoming increasingly clear, even in the free North. Quite apart from the necessary compensation, what was to become of southern production without slaves? And the North also benefited from this. The southern cotton made its way to Europe through the hands of northern merchants, traders and shippers; the south obtained its requirements from the northern manufacturers and merchants; even the northern farmer sold part of his produce to the southern planters, because they increasingly neglected agriculture and animal husbandry in favour of their staple products; important monetary and credit relations were established between North and South; finally, cotton had become the main export article for the whole Union, with the proceeds of which the largest part of the European import was paid. Slavery was certainly an evil thing, a blot on the Union: - but what to do? Individual, benevolent natures consoled themselves with the vague hope that "some day somebody will do something" about it. For the rest, the northerners closed their eyes and thanked God that they had nothing to do with it.

Even the southerners, although they came to appreciate the advantages of their peculiar institution more and more, nevertheless bowed for a long time during this period to the humane ideas of the 18th century: they were, in a sense, ashamed of slavery. It was therefore very common and very popular to blame the former English colonial government entirely for this “eyesore”; it was said that the Americans had previously resisted the introduction of slaves, but that England, then a wholesaler in human flesh, had forced the practice upon them through its self-serving trade policy — an excuse which, of course, contains only a grain of truth. The Southerners recognized the North's reluctance as justified, and they tolerated it formally as far as they could, without compromising on the substance. It is known that in the Federal Constitution of 1787 even the words "slave, slavery, slave trade" were avoided as if they were a desecration; they helped themselves with paraphrases, they spoke of "persons obliged to serve and work in any state according to the laws of that state" and the like. But the more the material development of the South progressed, the more these considerations were set aside; people themselves began to believe in

the excellence of the institution and wanted to accept the reluctance of the North only as a "prejudice" "which it must overcome." In 1818, for example, this argument was used to support a motion to renew and tighten the Extradition Act of 1793, which had hitherto remained a dead letter in the North; even some Northerners agreed, for political and financial reasons, but no result was achieved at the time. At last, however, a complete change took place in the public opinion of the South; they came to regard slavery as a blessing, as a divine ordinance. It was John E. Calhoun of South Carolina (Secretary of War under Monroe 1817-25, died 1850) who mediated this transition; of the American statesmen he first unhesitatingly proclaimed that slavery was divine in its origin and beneficent in its consequences; the Negroes were merely created slaves, and no other condition than servitude suited them; but slavery was also a blessing for the state, it was in truth the conservative principle of human society! Gradually these ideas spread, and in the 1930s even the ecclesiastical conferences of most denominations, at least in the southern states, came to sanction the slavery of the Negroes as God's order and to defend it with patient passages from the Bible. Finally, in the last decade, we have seen individual Southern statesmen teach that it would be best for the state, and no less for the people concerned, if the poor whites, the lower classes without distinction of race, were also reduced to servitude. Thus, the cycle of views on the peculiar institution of slave states was completed!

But we are ahead of our historical narrative. In the second decade, that change was only in the making. The North had come to terms with the existence of slavery—but should it be allowed to expand indefinitely? Weighty voices were raised against this. It is said that during the negotiations over Florida, the Crown of Spain was also prepared to cede Texas; but President Monroe rejected this, and, as it says in a private letter, "because he has long known the reluctance with which the eastern part of the Union, or rather those who enjoy the general confidence there, look to any enlargement to the west and south." After all, the two acquisitions of Louisiana and Florida had so far been exclusively to the advantage of the slave states! Despite this caution, a territorial dispute immediately broke out between the North and the South. In 1818, the territory of Missouri had declared itself an exception as a state; in February 1819, the matter came up in the House, the borders of the new state were drawn and at the same time it was decided to organize the southern part of the area as a separate territory of Arkansas. Now two northerners, Talmadge in regard to Missouri, Taylor in regard to Arkansas, made the motion that Congress should stipulate the abolition of slavery for the new state or the new territory. The matter would not have been difficult, for Missouri counted

only 10,000 slaves, and Arkansas only 1,600, hardly as many as New Jersey had at the time of abolition. The only difference was that Arkansas was located in the cotton zone - and so Taylor's proposal failed by a two-vote majority, and slavery remained permitted here. Missouri was different: this new state was suitable for free labour due to its climate and products, but also for slave breeding, as were all the middle states, and with the increasing demand for negroes, a new slave-breeding state had to be desirable for the South. The Southerners therefore fought Talmadge's proposal with the greatest zeal, threatening to break away from the Union and start a civil war. Nevertheless, the anti-slavery clause passed by 87 votes to 76. But in the Senate, they were more considerate of the South and rejected the clause by a large majority; another vote in both houses had the same result; the matter had to be reserved for the decision of the next Congress. In the meantime, a lively agitation immediately began in the North against any further extension of slavery; numerous popular assemblies and most of the legislatures of the free states, including that of the slave state of Delaware, declared themselves in favour of the clause; agitation against the clause was no less zealous in the South. But then it happened that in June 1819 Maine, which had hitherto belonged to Massachusetts, amicably separated from it and sought admission as a separate state. There was no objection to this, but the southerners used the incident in their favour by now asserting the idea of a balance of power. Until now, every territory, as soon as it had reached that level, was admitted as a state, regardless of whether it was a slave state or a free state; only in recent years has a semi-unconscious balancing system emerged, in which, since 1816, a free state and a slave state were excluded alternately year after year; finally, in 1819, a de facto balance (11 against 11) was established by the admission of Alabama. This balance, the Southerners now declared, must be maintained; if both Maine and Missouri were admitted to the Union as free states, the North's overbalance would be too great, and the South would feel its interests threatened. At the next Congress, these views prevailed in the Senate; it was determined that "the free state of Maine should be excluded on condition that at the same time the admission of Missouri as a slave state be permitted." In order to break the feared resistance, the southerners agreed to the addition of a clause: "in the remaining (then still unsettled) territory west of the Mississippi, north of 36° 30' latitude, slavery shall be forever prohibited." These stipulations, which in their entirety are referred to as the Missouri Compromise, were adopted in the Senate by 24 votes to 20; resistance in the House of Commons was more vigorous, and only after repeated rejections and after a concession had been made in form was it approved by 90 votes to 76. It was weak-hearted

Northerners in both houses who decided the victory of the slaveholders by their defection. The result, then, was that Missouri fell to the South, but that the slaveholders forever renounced any further expansion of slavery north of the imaginary boundary line.

More important than this immediate result, however, was the political significance of the Missouri Compromise: it recognized that the free North and the slaveholding South were two equal halves of the Union that should remain in balance with each other. And in order not to upset this balance, it became customary from then on to always couple a free state and a slave state together and admit both at the same time - Michigan and Arkansas in 1836, Iowa and Florida in 1845.

The most famous historian of North American slavery, Friedrich Kapp, proposed to divide American history since independence into two periods, the age of ideas without cotton and the age of cotton without ideas, since the Missouri Compromise could serve as the dividing line. *) As bold as this characterization sounds, it is essentially correct. For from now on the theory, the idea, loses weight everywhere in fact, and the practical interest, materialism, becomes decisive. From the equilibrium at first sought, it gradually came to pass, from one step to another, that the cotton interest and the policy of the southerners gained the upper hand in the Union. And this happened while and despite the fact that the North became proportionally stronger and the South weaker. As already mentioned, in 1820 the two halves of the Union were still fairly equal in population, the North had 5 million inhabitants, the South 4 ½ million, of whom the third part were slaves; since then, however, the ratio has become increasingly unfavourable to the latter, for not only does European immigration predominantly benefit the North, but statistics also show that domestic emigration from the South to the North is almost three times as great as vice versa. In 1850 the free North numbered 13 ½ million, the South 9 ½ million, of which one third were slaves; for the year 1860 the total population of the Union can be assumed to be 31 million, of which 19 million belong to the North, while 8 million are free and 4 million slaves belong to the South. Proportionally (it must be taken into account that, according to the Constitution, 3/5 of the slaves are counted in the balance of federal representation and taxation) - proportionally the share of the South in the lower house of Congress decreased; in 1800 the southern representatives made up 48, in 1820 still 42, in 1850 only 39 percent of the total number. Only in the upper house of Congress, to which each state sends two senators without distinction, were northerners and southerners in equal numbers

until 1850; then the North obtained the absolute majority here as well. And despite this smaller number of people and despite this smaller representation, we see how Southern labour has occupied a wider geographical area than the North, and how Southern politicians have tightened their grip on the reins of power.

---

*) First published: „Die Sklavensrage in den Bereinigten Staaten. Geschichtlich entwickelt. Göttingen 1854;" (The Slavery Question in the Confederate States. Historically developed), more recently the "Geschichte der Sklaverei in den Bereinigten Staaten von America. Hamburg 1861," (History of Slavery in the United States of America), where the development up to the fall of 1860 is described in detail. The latest events are summarized by Fr. Anneke: "Der zweite Freiheitskampf der Bereinigten Staaten von Nordamerica" (The second freedom struggle of the United States of North America), Frankfurt 1861, vol. 1 et seq.

Both are more or less directly related to the type of agriculture. With regard to the first point, one can generally say that the population in the north is more concentrated, while in the south it is more dispersed. Agriculture in the north, which mostly produces food, is practiced efficiently, the land is not thereby exhausted, but on the contrary becomes more valuable and thus always remains the secure basis of prosperity; at the same time cities are formed as the central points of trade and industry; only the natural surplus of the population penetrates further west and takes possession of the wilderness; thus colonization here makes only slower progress, but as it advances it leaves behind it a firmly settled, richly developed and flourishing country. It is different in the south; naturally, the stark contrasts are mediated by various transitional stages. The southern plantation business, i.e. the cultivation of staple products, is for the most part a mere overexploitation, and its evil consequences cannot be more aptly described than in the words of Representative C. E. Clay of Alabama: "The small planters skim the cream from their land, and as they are unable to replace it by fallowing, fertilizing, etc., they move with their slaves farther west or south to seek other virgin land, which they exploit and impoverish in the same way. The richer planters, equipped with more means and skill, buy out their smaller neighbours, expand their plantations and increase their slave population. Wandering through the country, one comes upon numerous farm-houses, once the residences of industrious and intelligent freemen; now they are inhabited by slaves, or empty, deserted, and decayed; one meets with fields, once fertile, now overgrown with weeds; moss grows on the crumbling walls of once lively patches, and in the hands of one master one finds all the property which once afforded a dozen white families happy harvests. Indeed, the country (Alabama),

which has not yet passed its infancy, already bears on its brow the sad marks of old age and decay, like Virginia and the Carolinas!" - In these words lies the key to the mystery of how the plantation and slave labour of the South, despite the smaller population, flooded a larger area so much faster than the free labour of the North. This explains no less why the South was constantly striving for new conquests; it was here that the annexation of Texas, the war against Mexico, the Filibuster campaigns [1]) against Central America and the West Indies were instigated, here that the theory of "manifest destiny" was developed.

---

1) A filibuster (also known as a freebooter), is someone who engages in an unauthorized military expedition into a foreign country or territory to foster or support a political revolution or secession.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Filibuster_(military)

The second moment, the political ascendancy of the South, is also explained by agrarian conditions. In the North, the small estate, the farm, which the owner cultivates with his family, is the rule. Here, therefore, a general average prosperity prevails (apart, of course, from the large cities, which produce sharp differences), and here, too, the existing democratic state constitutions have their natural basis in a democratic society. Gradual transitions lead over to the stark contrast that the south presents. According to previous economic experience, the cultivation of the staple products there, cotton and also sugar, can only be carried out advantageously on a large scale, on plantations with slave labour; the number of planters, however, is naturally very limited, as is the number of large landowners everywhere. According to the census of 1850, there were only 347,525 slave owners for every 6,222,418 whites in the South, and of these only 92,257 were owners of more than ten slaves; so even these cannot all be counted as planters. We have seen above from Clay's words the relations of the small planters; they are, so to speak, the nomads and the pioneers of the South; the older a cotton state becomes, the more this class disappears, and all valuable landed property, all wealth accumulates in the hands of a small basic aristocracy, against whose power and influence nothing can rise. With the exception of Charleston and New Orleans, there are hardly any large cities in the South that could form a counterweight; the free white population has even less weight; the small planter, the farmer, the craftsman must fear and bow down to the rich and powerful neighbour. And quite pitiable is the lot of the poor white man, who possesses nothing but the strength of his hands, - for slavery

reduces the wages of labour to the lowest level, and even at the lowest price the free white man will not easily find regular employment with the planter: nor does he seek it, for field labour is the trade of the slave and is considered degrading to the free man, who therefore forsakes every other means of escape. "The poor whites," says Hammond of South Carolina, "obtain a precarious subsistence by occasional employment, by hunting and fishing, by plundering fields and stables, and only too often by trading with the slaves, whom they instigate to steal for them." It is, to use the own words of two other Southerners, "a poor, degraded, half-starved, half-naked, and ignorant white population, dragging along an existence only one step above that of the savage in the forest." The greater the poverty and brutality, the greater the dependence and servility of the poor whites towards the planter, who in turn looks down on these "white niggers" with unconcealed contempt. Thus, it came about that the Southern press in the last decade openly and unanimously preached the barbaric principle: "Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the labouring man, be he white or black; free society and its self-government is an absurdity, a delusion which the North will also have to renounce in the end!"

Thus: society in the South is thoroughly aristocratically structured, and of course, despite all democratic constitutions, only the basic aristocracy of the planters has any real political influence; in the cotton states they are virtually the sole rulers, In the middle states, at least they are the leaders; here and there they monopolize and award public offices, despite universal suffrage and through it. In federal politics, too, this elite alone represents the whole South; and it is it, therefore, which first enforced the recognition of the balance between the two halves of the Union, and then obtained complete supremacy, - a small aristocracy over a large, free people. Many things came to its aid. First of all, it should be noted that a hereditary aristocracy - and the planters are indeed such - possesses a certain political tradition, more coherence, discipline and consistency than the individual leaders who emerge from the mass of a free people. The northerner is only exceptionally a politician; the main thing for him remains to acquire wealth and a bourgeois position; only then can he enter the political arena with success; but even the highest success offers no more, indeed not as much, as could be achieved on other paths of life, and that is why politics by no means expresses such an unconditional attraction for northern talents. The southern aristocrat, on the other hand, has his position in life by birth; from his youth he feels himself to be a member of the ruling caste, and the political career is for the talented one of the few ways out in keeping with his station, the civil service for the younger sons a provision in keeping with their station: everywhere, in the cabinet, in diplomacy, in military service, we find from the first a

preponderance of southerners. The situation was different in Congress, however. In the Senate they had (from 1820 to 50) only just half the votes, and in the House of Representatives a decided minority; but in all great questions the interests of all slaveholders and planters are always identical, while in the free North, with its manifold agricultural, industrial and commercial development, the most diverse interests intersect. Thus the united Southern phalanx was always bound to impress, the more so as it maintained an energetic and victorious attitude under all circumstances; its usual means of fright was to threaten the dissolution of the Union and to disfigure corresponding demonstrations in the Southern States; then, in the large northern cities connected with the cotton interest, both the merchants and shipowners, as well as the poor working class, trembled; in the Congress and in the popular assemblies, fearful or blinded Northerners developed the greatest zeal for the "salvation" of the Union, and if the South then only gave way in some minor matter, it could be sure of getting its way in the main matter - what was called a compromise. And it wasn't just the fearful and those who wanted to save the state; obedient servants were also found in the north; ambitious and greedy politicians naturally found it more advantageous to rely on the tightly knit southern phalanx than on the fickle northern factions; these "Northern men with Southern principles" were then the tools and champions of the slaveholders - all in the hope of political advancement. The matter became especially bad since the party antagonisms lost more and more of their spiritual content, since the parties degenerated into coteries and the party struggles into a mere tussle for the enjoyment and advantages of governmental power. It is Jackson's administration (1829 to 37) from which this change dates; just as he introduced strict discipline, unconditional obedience into party life, so he also established the principle: "To the victor belong the spoils!" - i.e. after every presidential election, all offices in the federal service, now around 50,000, are filled by the supporters of the successful candidate. A principle that has plunged the United States into an abyss of political corruption, so that even in the Senate in Washington a few years ago the confession was made: "There is no other government on earth as corrupt as the American one." Since then, the poor and ignoble, but acquisitive elements, especially the rabble of the large cities of the North, have become accustomed to seeking a buyer for their votes and their political services; and to make matters worse, the more disgusting and sordid these activities became, the more the educated classes, the rich and independent people, withdrew from any participation in public life; thus, the "professional politicians" were given a completely free hand, and the southern phalanx knew how to exploit this admirably. Thus, the words that John Randolph of Virginia had already proclaimed to the

Northerners during the debates about the Missouri Compromise were fully fulfilled: "We will not rule you by our black slaves, but by your own white slaves!"

With all this, the supremacy of the Southerners was always only a de facto and uncertain one; the majority of the North remained and grew, and if it once pulled itself together and made full use of its power in the election of a new administration, it could easily put an end to the matter; by an act of election it could regain its natural preponderance in Congress and in the administration, - as it finally did in 1860. No wonder, therefore, that the southern aristocracy desired to secure its authoritative influence by constitutional provisions. Their political grand master Calhoun developed this idea. In the work he left behind (A Disquisition on Government; Charleston 1851) he seeks to prove that in a republic and with universal suffrage the mere rule of the majority must lead to a pernicious despotism and endanger the rights of the individual; the only antidote consists in the legal recognition of competing majorities; they form the antithesis to the mere numerical majority and give the threatened parts or interests of society the right of negation and separation from the actions of the other parts and interests that threaten them. In order to make this theory practical, he reverted to a party standpoint that had already been overcome. In an empire of such size and diversity as the Union, a national, centralist party and a particularist, decentralizing party must naturally oppose each other; it is the former that has achieved the transformation of the original confederation of states into a federal state; they were called the "Federalists," their opponents the "Anti-Federalists"; they could just as well be called the "Party of National Sovereignty" and the "Party of State Sovereignty." Under the federal constitution, these parties continued under various names, naturally with diluted content; the point of contention now was only whether or not as many large national institutions as possible should be created, and even the principled opponents, as soon as they themselves took the helm of government, gradually changed their minds, so that for the time being, a complete disintegration and blurring of party differences occurred. It was about this time that Calhoun incorporated the original rugged idea of state sovereignty into his system: - the individual states were to be regarded as concurrent majorities. "As in Rome the power of the patricians was limited by the unconditional veto of the tribunes, as in the Polish Diet every member had a free veto: so in the United States every single state shall have the right and power to destroy such an impairing act." This is the so-called nullification theory, and its natural consequence is the right of secession. This theory was first proclaimed and practically applied by the Legislature of Georgia in 1826, when the lands of the Creeks and Cherokees were in question; President J.

Adams laid the matter before Congress, but nothing was done. The second time was because of the tariff issue; South Carolina and Georgia nullified the protective tariff legislation passed by Congress in 1828 at a joint convention in Columbia in November 1832 and called for others to follow suit. This time Calhoun hoped that President Jackson would officially recognize his theory; but Jackson answered him with the well-known saying, "The Union must and shall be preserved!" and when his ships and troops arrived off Charleston to chastise the "traitors," the nullifiers revoked their resolutions. After this failure, there was no hope of any recognition of Calhoun's theory on the part of the Federal Government; but it remained a constant article of faith among the Southern Radicals, and the present Revolution has been embellished by it. Calhoun, for his part, seems later to have given further consideration to the question, and to have devised another way out, in order to give the South the legal power of self-protection against the dangers of the Northern majority. In Congress, shortly before his death in March 1850, he repeatedly spoke of the necessity of an amendment to the federal constitution; he wanted to have two presidents elected, one from the free states and another from the slave states; the acts of Congress, however, were not to become law until they had been approved and signed by both presidents. Calhoun buried this plan. - The Southern aristocracy thus had to be content with the actual possession of power; it asserted it for a long time and abused it terribly; then, when the North rose up and asserted its majority, it raised the flag of rebellion. –

A brief survey of the historical development since 1820 will best explain the foregoing narrative and show the gradual growth of Southern influence. The first decade after the Missouri Compromise is the "age of good understanding" and has no major party struggles. However, a first clash should be emphasized. The struggles for freedom in Spanish America aroused general sympathy at that time, and it is well known how President Monroe encouraged them by the so-called Monroe Doctrine of 1823; Henry Clay even wanted to establish a closer relationship between the new states and the Union and to oppose a great confederation of American republics to the "holy alliance" of Europe; President Adams finally requested, on December 26, 1825, that the Congress of Panama convened by Bolivar be sent to him. The slaveholders, however, opposed this; for the sake of the security of their own slave property, as little as possible should be done with such states where Negroes and coloured people were equal to whites; they therefore claimed that the interests of their peculiar institution should be decisive for the foreign policy of the Union. Although they were unable to get away with this, they succeeded in dragging the matter out for so long that nothing came of the legation to Panama. Then followed

the two nullification attempts of 1826 and 1832 already mentioned; the theory was admittedly not recognized, - but the guilty parties remained unpunished, and concessions were in fact made to them. Georgia, with the help of President Jackson, later asserted its will over the Indian lands; in the tariff question, where for the moment the South found a confederate in the Northwest - both as farmers against the industrial East - the compromise of 1833 was reached, so that the "Palmetto State" of South Carolina could justly boast of a victory. In the winter of 1835-36, the South won two more victories: Congress authorized an expansion of the state of Missouri to include the northwest corner of the Missouri River, converting free land into slave land and violating the Missouri Compromise for the first time (an important precedent!). And the Congress, despite vigorous opposition, approved the constitution of the new state of Arkansas, which contained a clause forbidding for all time any law for the emancipation of slaves, that is, the perpetuation of slavery in Arkansas was declared and recognized - something that had never happened in any slave state.

It was only a natural consequence that these increasing encroachments by the South reawakened Northern opposition to slavery, which had long been dormant. Partly following the simultaneous agitation in England, the new abolition societies were formed in Boston in 1830, which have continued ever since, and developed a lively propaganda for the immediate abolition of slavery; in 1833 they held their first major convention in Philadelphia, which was attended by ten free states. It cannot be denied that in their initial zeal they often overstepped the bounds, even though some things, such as the Virginia Slave Conspiracy of 1831 [1]), were unjustly attributed to them. Be that as it may, the slaveholders and everything connected with the cotton interest went into a rage; the southern states took extraordinary security measures, they demanded from the northern governorates the suppression of the abolition societies, the extradition of the spokesmen, etc., - of course in vain. The mob of New York [2]) was more willing to serve, blowing up an abolitionist convention in July 1834. Equally willing to serve was the federal power: Postmaster General Kendall expressly authorized the postmasters to censor and confiscate dangerous writings; President Jackson recommended the adoption of a corresponding law, December 1835, which, however, did not pass; in Congress it was resolved in 1836 and 1838 that all petitions which in any way referred to slavery should be returned unconsidered! But if these were all clear signs of the growth of southern supremacy, it manifested itself most decisively in the annexation of Texas. This ancient Mexican province, located under the cotton zone, had welcomed a large number of American settlers in recent decades, mostly slaveholders from the

neighbouring southern states; naturally, they sympathized with them and felt drawn to the Union; when they were finally strong enough, they shook off the Mexican yoke in 1836. From North America, where politicians and speculators calculated the value of the beautiful country, the revolutionary desires were stirred up, from there the revolution was supported and the new republic was recognized as soon as possible; this then gave itself a constitution after the pattern of the slave states and already in 1837 asked for an exception to the Union.

---

1) Nat Turner's Rebellion in August 1831, otherwise known as the Southampton Insurrection, was a slave rebellion in Southampton County, Virginia, in which between 55 and 65 white people were killed.

2) The New York anti-abolitionist riots (1834). Beginning on July 7, 1834, New York City was torn by a huge anti-abolitionist riot (also called Farren Riot or Tappan Riot) that lasted for nearly a week until it was put down by military force.

A double danger had to be considered in this question: the annexation of Texas would have increased the slave territory and the number of slave states - which could arouse jealousy in the free North; and then: the annexation necessarily entailed a war with Mexico, as this republic constantly protested against Texan independence, and Mexico might even find allies in the jealous maritime powers. Both concerns led President van Buren to reject the matter; under his successor Thier, Secretary of State Calhoun concluded an annexation treaty, but this was rejected by the Senate in 1844. Then the Democratic party, whose nucleus from the beginning formed the Southern phalanx, made annexation the rallying cry for the next election, and with all the means at its disposal its candidate Polk won under this sign; - the admission of Texas took place in 1845. Thus, the preponderance of the South was completely decided; it became evident that where Southern interests were in question, no consideration of any kind applied. For the moment, even the number of slave states now predominated (15 against 14 free ones); a further increase of slave states was also secured by the provision that up to four new states could be formed from the Texan territory in the future; and only incidentally was the Missouri Compromise expressly confirmed again to reassure the North. Under such circumstances, it was only an act of self-defence when northern politicians tried at the next opportunity to prevent at least a further expansion of the slave territory. When the eventual success of the war against Mexico was undoubted, Congressman David Wilmot of Pennsylvania proposed "that slavery should be excluded from all

territories to be acquired in peace," a demand that was all the more justified since there was no slavery in Mexico under the constitution. This so-called Wilmot Proviso was adopted by the House of Representatives on August 8, 1846, but remained unfinished for this session in the Senate. In the next session it was again introduced in the House of Commons, first rejected, but approved on a third attempt, February 15, 1847; but now the Senate, this time as always the stronghold of the cotton interest, rejected it, - and thereupon the House of Commons gave way. Immediately, however, the Wilmot Proviso played an important role in the next presidential election campaign. The Democratic party and the candidate it nominated absolutely rejected the Proviso; the result was that a large part of the Northern Democrats broke away, formed their own faction and nominated their own candidates; they called themselves the Free-soilers and placed the Wilmot Proviso at the head of their program, August 1848; individual Whigs also joined, but the defection there was far less. And the success showed that the Democrats were defeated by this division: the Whiggish candidates triumphed. That was at least a warning for the southern politicians. In May 1848, Wisconsin was excluded as a free state and thus the equal number (15 against 15 states) was restored; in August 1848, the territory of Oregon was organized and slavery was expressly prohibited in the relevant law there, which ensured further growth for the free North. The next winter Congress negotiated the organization of the territories ceded by Mexico - California, Utah, New Mexico, and all persuasions and threats failed because of the steadfast stance of the House of Representatives; the slaveholders had to be content that they could prevent any result through the Senate. In March 1849, another new territory without slavery, Minnesota, was organized, also a future free state. Finally, the new state, which had grown up under particularly fortunate circumstances on the Pacific coast, California, banned slavery in its constitution of October 13, 1849, and sought admission to the Union as a free state.

Thus, it seemed that the previous rule of the southern aristocracy was coming to an end. Naturally, their bitterness knew no bounds, and they did all they could to assert their power. The next session of Congress (December 1849 to September 1850) would bring the decisive battle, and the very beginning showed that this time the usual means of intimidation, etc., were again at work as usual. The Wilmot Proviso was introduced twice more under different guises, but both times it was rejected by the House of Representatives. The slaveholders asserted that it would be unfair, indeed, contrary to the Constitution, if they were to be denied the right to move with their property, their slaves, to the new Mexican conquests; some went even further: the transition to American rule would automatically abolish the old

Mexican prohibition and slavery would be considered legal - assertions that gradually led to the southern heresy that "slavery is a national institution." They therefore claimed all three territories for their use as slave lands; the more moderate at least wanted the line of the Missouri Compromise to be extended to the Pacific and all land south of it to be given over to slavery. California, however, had already decided for itself, and no one could reasonably think of imposing slavery on this state against its will; the admission of the latter was therefore a matter of course; but the Southerners acted as if they were making a tremendous sacrifice in order to demand the greatest possible compensation in other respects. For their part, the northerners fought these claims and arguments vigorously. The party struggle reached an unprecedented level of bitterness. Now the state saviours began to move, proposals for compromise were put forward, and an eight-month debate ensued. The defection of a Northern statesman contributed materially to the decision; Daniel Webster of Massachusetts, as late as 1848, when he was proposed by the Northern faction of the Whigs as a candidate for the presidency, had declared himself in favour of the Wilmot proposition; now he changed his mind entirely, - because he wanted to become president, and he realized that only the powerful southern aristocracy could help him achieve his ambition. On March 7, 1850, he delivered his famous speech in which he recommended that the North should submit unconditionally: "It is of no avail, cotton is our present and future; the slave power is so great that we must bow in humility and silence our better judgment." - "Cotton is king" was how the same thought was later expressed in a striking way. - And this renegade now came to the helm of state; Fillmore, who became president after Taylor's death (July 9, 1850), chose Webster as his secretary of state. Now the slaveholders had all the power and funds of the federal government at their disposal to enforce the compromise proposals, and the result was that the northern majority crumbled. In September the five laws were passed, which came to be known collectively as the Compromise of 1850; two of them were regarded as concessions by the South, namely, the admission of California as a free state and the suppression of the slave market in the federal city of Washington, - the former, as already stated, a matter of necessity and the latter a mere local police regulation. For these sham concessions, the North had to submit to a strict extradition and hunting law against fugitive slaves; it also had to renounce the Wilmot Proviso. In regard to the two territories of Utah and New Mexico, it was determined that they should be exempted as states for the time being, with or without slavery, as the respective populations might decide. Such a decision, to prohibit slavery or not, by the inhabitants of a territory had in fact already taken place several times, as for

example in Missouri and California; in the presidential election campaign of 1848 the Democratic party had preached the same doctrine; legally, however, this principle of "squatter sovereignty" was now legally recognized for the first time, albeit only for the two territories mentioned.

The Compromise of 1850 was deservedly met with the greatest indignation in the free North. Anything else would probably have been tolerated: the territories of Utah and New Mexico, with their remoteness and merely sporadic fertility, were of little value, and it was not yet foreseeable that the principle of squatter sovereignty would later lead to greater misfortune; but one measure struck public opinion too harshly in the face - the law on the extradition of fugitive slaves. A similar law had been in existence since 1793; but it had in fact long been a dead letter, as the legislatures of most of the Free States had gradually prohibited the state authorities by law from taking any part in the execution of that law. Now the federal authorities took matters into their own hands with the law of 1850: special judges (commissioners) were appointed by the federal government and the necessary expenses were borne by the federal treasury; at the same time, all citizens were obliged to help catch the fugitives if called upon to do so, and any help given to the fugitives was threatened with imprisonment for up to 6 months or a fine of up to 1000 dollars, plus 1000 dollars compensation to the owner. So: the federal government gave itself up to slave catchers, and the free North was not only to become a hunting ground for slave hunters, but its many millions of free citizens were also to serve as henchmen under penalty of punishment; - all this for the benefit and in the service of the small slaveholding aristocracy of the South! Certainly the indignation was justified; the extent of it was proved, for example, by the resolution of the city council of Chicago (Illinois), which virtually nullified the new law; numerous popular assemblies spoke out to the same effect, and the southern slave-hunters found in the North, instead of help, now only chicane and resistance to a greater extent than before. On the other hand, the southern aristocracy, together with their usual confederates, now did all they could to break the resistance of the North; the professional state saviours and the refined elements of the large maritime cities formed so-called Union Committees, held meetings and bought newspapers in which the compromise was defended and its opponents denounced as disturbers of the peace, abolitionists and traitors to the fatherland, who were subject to the revenge of the native mob and the southern planters. The federal government resorted to the most extreme measures; its courts, its money, its troops and ships were at the disposal of the slave hunters; it claimed for the same purpose the unconditional disposition of the militia of the individual states; citizens

who refused to help the federal officials in catching slaves were tried as high traitors, and to every acquitting verdict of the northern jurors the government responded with a new persecution: indeed, from time to time it even came to the use of armed force, to bloodshed, where the population physically resisted the slave catchers. For the free people of colour in the North, this was a truly terrifying time, for they were handed over to the alleged owner on the most insignificant of indications. Nevertheless, relatively few refugees were brought in, as they found help everywhere, and soon most of the northern states enacted special laws "for the protection of personal liberty" (personal-Iibertv-bills). Thus, the Extradition Act did little for the South; it uselessly embittered the North and spurred its resistance.

In the midst of this excitement began the campaign of 1852, in which the Democratic party placed the Compromise at the head of its platform as final and unalterable, and declared any further agitation on the slavery question inadmissible; its candidate for the presidency was Franklin Pierce. The old General Scott was presented by the Whigs; they also recognized the Compromise, but only simply as a law of the land, but their most outstanding party leader, William H. Seward of New York, who had preferably promoted Scott's nomination, was known enough as an opponent of slavery since the Congress of 1850. The result was that even the last southern Whigs now defected to the opposing camp, as did Webster, despite his disappointed ambitions; he brought his personal supporters (the Webster Whigs) and the administration's support to the Democrats. A large part of the Free-Soil Party also followed the example of their leader, Van Buren, and returned to their old party for the time being. Finally, all cotton interests, all state saviours, and all those who feared the worst voted for the Democratic program in the North, believing that this would solve the slave question once and for all. Thus, Pierce was elected president by a majority not seen since Jackson's time.

By this victory the Democratic party had completely identified itself with the slavery and cotton interest, that is, with the supremacy of the South over the North. Whiggism, however, had ceased to exist as a national party; it no longer had any following in the South, and even the Northern Whigs were splintering into numerous loose factions over all sorts of minor issues, since no new unifying principle had yet been established. And this alone explains why a hitherto quite insignificant faction, the Naturists or Knownothings, was able to gain adherents so quickly in the Northern and Middle States and grow into a large American party, which, however, was shattered by the slavery question just as quickly as it arose. The noise made by Knownothingism has long concealed, at least from superficial observers, how a new

freedom party was quietly forming in opposition to slavery; the nucleus of this party was formed by the Free Soil Men, who quickly withdrew from the alliance with the Democrats, and the so-called Seward-Whigs, under Seward's personal leadership; gradually the two drew closer together, merged and gained more and more adherents, until finally, at the convention in Philadelphia, July 17, 1856, the great party of the Democrats was formed. July 17, 1856, the great party of the Republicans was constituted, which leans exclusively on the free North and defends its rights.

That this party grew so rapidly and so vigorously was largely due to the tremendous abuse which the Democracy had made of its victory of 1852. During the campaign they had loudly declared any further agitation on the slavery question inadmissible, and now, after the victory, they were the first to break this promise and to strive for a further territorial extension of slavery at the expense of the free North. And yet this was only natural. As already mentioned, the southern phalanx, which formed the core of the party, realized quite well that their tyranny had no secure foundation. The North was not only richer in population, property and education, it had greater representation, - since 1850 16 free states against 15 slave states, - but in addition to all this it was assured of a large increase. Especially the already organized free territories of Minnesota and Oregon. Furthermore, the still unsettled vast area between the Missouri River and the Rocky Mountains, then commonly called Nebraska, which is bordered to the south by Indian Territory, Texas and New Mexico, to the north by the British possessions; for this whole area fell under the clause of the Missouri Compromise of 1820, according to which slavery was prohibited north of 36°30’ north latitude in the western Mississippi Valley (Louisiana), so that here, too, was a plantation of future free states. On the other hand, the South had already occupied all its available land; only the two territories of Utah and New Mexico, which were opened to slaveholders by the Compromise of 1850, could at best still be won for the group of slave states; but these were of little value to the planter and were already occupied elsewhere for the most part. It was therefore foreseeable that the majority of the North would become more and more overwhelming if the South did not acquire other sources of growth. The first thought was of foreign conquests; since 1850 the series of filibustering campaigns began, which were directed from the southern states towards the West Indies, Central America and Mexico. President Fillmore tried to put a stop to these undertakings, which were contrary to international law; under Pierce, who, in order to gain a second election, was an obedient servant of the South in all matters, they had quite free scope; the doctrine of the "manifest destiny" of the Union to seize at least all of

North America was now preached; and Pierce's successor, Buchanan, who had already professed the same principles in the infamous Ostend Manifesto [1]) (Oct. 1854), persisted in the same policy. However, the North remained from the outset indifferent and averse to these plans for expansion, which could only work to the advantage of the South and slavery; in whatever way the administration tried, the right warlike mood could not be aroused, and so a national war of conquest was impossible; but little success was to be hoped from the filibustering campaigns, as they all came to a miserable end. What wonder that the southern politicians were now thinking of an internal conquest? The territory of Nebraska was well situated with splendid communications resources, outside the actual cotton zone, but just as suitable for slave breeding as Missouri, Kentucky and Virginia; if it could be won for slavery, the South would have the advantage, that it would strengthen itself for the future and at the same time weaken the North. Of course, the anti-slavery clause of 1820 stood in the way of this, and this clause was the price for which the North agreed to accept Missouri as a slave state at that time, so any challenge to it was a breach of contract; - but no one was afraid of that. It was only a matter of putting a cloak over the matter, and for this purpose a Northern man of Southern principles, who speculated on the presidency, was employed, Senator S. A. Douglas of Illinois. In the congressional session of the winter of 1853 - 54 the so-called Nebrasca-Bill was negotiated, whereby the territory was divided and organized into two parts (Nebrasca between the 40° and 49°, and Kansas south of the 40° north latitude). On this occasion, Douglas demanded that the principle of squatter sovereignty be applied here as well; what was permitted to the inhabitants of Utah and New Mexico, namely to decide for themselves on the introduction or exclusion of slavery, must also be permitted here; however, the contrary clause of the Missouri Compromise must be repealed, because it was "incompatible with the non-intervention of Congress in the slave affairs of the states and territories, as was also recognized in the compromise legislation of 1850." We can go as little into the groundlessness of the arguments put forward here as into the spectacles which the debate would entail; enough, after months of discussion the Senate adopted the bill with the desired amendment on March 4; In the House of Representatives, the struggle dragged on for much longer; with the help of the federal government, it was necessary to first create a majority through bribery and similar means, and then, in violation of the Rules of Procedure, to overpower the now minority, whereupon approval was granted here as well on May 22, 1854. A few days later, the petition became law. The treaty had been broken; the free North had been deprived of its inheritance in the free West and the latter was exposed to the flood of slavery. It is

remarkable that in both houses all the Whigs without exception voted against the Bill; the disgrace fell on the Democratic party alone.

---

1) The Ostend Manifesto, also known as the Ostend Circular, was a document written in 1854 that described the rationale for the United States to purchase Cuba from Spain while implying that the U.S. should declare war if Spain refused.

This time the unwillingness of the free North was more unanimous and more violent than ever before; only individual politicians of craft, who wished to forge Northerners and Southerners together for their party purposes, dared to defend the Nebraska Bill, but they found no hearing; even in the great maritime cities, where the cotton interest had hitherto been all-powerful, high and low unanimously condemned the breach of the treaty. And best of all, the words did not stop there. In the name of squatter sovereignty the free people of the North had been deprived of their inheritance: through squatter sovereignty it was determined to regain it. First, it was Kansas, because that was where the decision lay. Previously, only individual slaveholders from neighbouring northwestern Missouri had immigrated to this area; if it was possible to bring so many free settlers there within a short time that they obtained the majority, a ban on slavery, a "free Kansas" was assured when the territory was constituted in the near future. There was speculation about this in the North, and associations were formed there, including the "New England Emigrant Aid Society" in Boston, which supported and promoted emigration from the free states to Kansas in every way. As a result, a few thousand free farmers from New England and the Northwest had already settled in Kansas by the fall of 1854. When the slaveholders realized this plan of operation, they in turn called on the South for help; but the South lacked the abundance of money and men to provide a similar supply, and the mere threats that all "damned northern Negro thieves" would be chased away or even hanged were of no avail: within a short time, the Free State Party had an undoubted majority, and its victory seemed certain. The opposing party, led by David Atchinson, then Vice President of the United States, then resorted to other means; when the election of a delegate to Congress was to take place on November 29, 1854, about 1,500 Missouri ruffians crossed the border into Kansas and crowded into the polls, so that a pro-slavery man was elected; Governor Reeder, who had been appointed as a reward for his cooperation in the Nebraska Bill, dutifully recognized this election. Encouraged by this, they did the same in the elections for the territorial legislature on March 30, 1855; about 2,600 "frontier ruffians," armed to the teeth, marched in from Missouri with two cannons, occupied

the polling places, chased away the free-statesmen who were eligible to vote, and then elected representatives who were entirely pro-southern. This, however, seemed too much for the governor; upon complaint, he cancelled several elections and travelled to Washington himself to request help against the brutalities of the Missourians, but in vain. President Pierce, as an obedient servant of the South, even went so far as to justify those acts of violence in his official organ as "provoked by the abolitionists", so that it now became clear to everyone how the squatter sovereignty was only to be used for the benefit of the South. The Kansas legislature (elected in this manner), which convened in July 1855, immediately adopted all of Missouri's legislation and thus slavery en bloc; Governor Reeder, however, who was completely opposed to these actions, was removed from office by the president on July 29 after attempts at bribery and intimidation had failed. Thus, the last obstacle was removed; the new Governor Shannon allowed himself to be used for anything; the slave state party now had a completely free hand, and from then on, with the help of the Missouri frontiersmen, they exercised a reign of terror over their opponents, even resorting to murder and arson. Then the Free State party, after a long period of passive resistance, finally got their act together; on October 9 they elected delegates to a constituent assembly on their own initiative; this assembly met in Topeca on October 23 and drafted the so-called Topeca Constitution, which was sanctioned by a referendum on December 15. On January 17, 1856, elections were held for the territorial offices, and on March 1, the government and the legislature of the free-state men were constituted, which immediately sent a petition to Congress for the admission of Kansas as a free state and then adjourned again. You can imagine that the older slave state legislature, which met in Lecompton, and Governor Shannon described this action by the Free State men as “high treason” and “rebellion” and prosecuted them; President Pierce also shared this view, as he expressed in a message to Congress. He provided the governor with regular military forces to combat the “rebels” and had soldiers break up the Topeka legislature when it reconvened on July 4. The federal courts were no less zealous in prosecuting all prominent Free State men with “high treason.” Under such auspices, Atchinson's gangs were allowed to do anything: they rampaged like savages, burned, hanged, shot, scalped, and above all, looted to their hearts' content; their greatest feat was the conquest and plundering of the city of Lawrence on May 21, with the Missourians also receiving assistance from bands of ruffians from Alabama, South Carolina, etc.; Similarly, during the summer of 1856, they blocked the main waterway to Kansas, the Missouri River, for several weeks, thus obstructing the most convenient route for northern immigration, until the shipowners, merchants,

innkeepers, etc. in St. Louis and other cities, who were severely affected by this, enforced the lifting of the blockade. For their part, the Free State party, which was enlarging more and more, gradually rose up in armed resistance, and Kansas now became the scene of a guerrilla war; - but the United States colonel Sumner, by chasing the Free State troops of both parties apart with his dragoons as much as he could, prevented the worst. Governor Shannon also gradually tired of the violence and drew closer to the Free State party; as a result, he was given his resignation on Atchinson's complaint. President Pierce now sent a third governor, Geary, September, 1856, who, as a "sound" Democrat, leaned toward the South; but he was an honest man and wanted peace and order and equal justice for both parties. When the slave statesmen realized this, they made his life so unpleasant that he resigned his office on March 4, 1857. Like his predecessor Reeder, he had to flee secretly from Kansas; like Reeder, he renounced the Democratic Party, completely converted, and joined the Republicans.

The tragedy in bleeding Kansas increased the sympathy of the North for the cause of freedom to the highest degree; not only did it grant more and more support, but the Northern delegates also appeared in Congress with unusual determination. Two delegates from Kansas had appeared there, Whitfield for the slave men, ex-Governor Reeder for the Free State party. Both presented the matter; the president's proposal to admit Kansas as a slave state was ignored: instead, on March 19, 1856, the House of Representatives set up an investigative committee, which in its report fully exposed the election fraud and acts of violence. In response, at the beginning of 1857, the House decided that all acts of the so-called Lecompton legislature were null and void because they had not been elected by the actual inhabitants of the territory but had been imposed on them by intruders; —a decision that did not become law, however, because the Senate refused to give its consent. - Kansas also played an important role in the presidential election campaign of 1856; the Republicans, who in their program (apart from some old Whig principles) demanded the exclusion of slavery from the territories and the revocation of squatter sovereignty, had made “free Kansas” their rallying cry, and this had a magical effect in the North. Thus, the Democratic party, which otherwise clung to its gains of 1850 and '54, deceptively adopted the same slogan, at least in the northern states where victory was doubtful, and this alone gave them the decisive victory in Pennsylvania; the Republican Fremont was defeated, and Buchanan ascended to the presidency on March 4, 1857.

A few days after Buchanan's installation, a decision of the Supreme Court in Washington was published, which completed the victory of the Democratic party and fulfilled the boldest dreams of the slaveholders. It concerned a Negro slave named Dred Scott; born in the state of Missouri, he was taken by his master, the United States Army physician Dr. Emerson, during a garrison change in 1834 to Rock Island in the Free State of Illinois and in 1838 to Fort Snelling in the Free Territory of Minnesota, where he married a fellow slave. Then Dr. Emerson returned to Missouri and sold the couple and two minors to a Mr. Sandford. It was only after a number of years that Scott was informed that a slave brought by his owner to a free state or a free territory thereby attained his freedom according to recognized law. He therefore sued in a Missouri state court in the early 1950s, claiming that Sandford was unlawfully holding him and his family in slavery; the court found the claim well-founded and acquitted him; in the second instance, however, the Missouri Supreme Court ruled in favour of the defendant, and the Federal Circuit Court (circuit court) upheld the ruling that Scott and his family were slaves. Now the plaintiff appealed to the Supreme Court, where the case was first heard in December 1855, but it was not until March 7, 1857, that the judgment was rendered: as a result, the district court's ruling was annulled due to exceeding its jurisdiction and the court was ordered to declare itself incompetent in the matter. In fact, the judgment of the Missouri Supreme Court remained in effect, the Scott family in slavery. — The Supreme Court in Washington, however, had not contented itself with deciding the individual case; it consisted entirely of "healthy" democrats and therefore seized this opportunity to casually exhaust the entire slavery question in its judgment and the reasons for its decision, and to legally justify the slaveholders' extreme theorems by sophistry based on the Federal Constitution. To appreciate the importance of this procedure, one must know that the Supreme Court, albeit abusively, actually exercises the right to interpret the Federal Constitution authentically through its findings and motives. In the published official summary, which is based on the reasoning of President Taney and one judge (the other seven differed to a greater or lesser extent), 31 different points are described as having been decided by the present judgment. For example, "that slaves and people of colour can never be citizens of the United States, but are recognized by the Federal Constitution as persons whom the moral law permits to be treated as mere property and held in slavery; the Federal power is bound to protect this property, and the legislature has no greater power over it than over any other property; accordingly, the slaveholder may take his slaves into the Territories and possess them there as well as any other property, and any law which restricts this right, such as the Missouri Compromise, is unconstitutional." According

to this theory, the southerners would not have needed squatter sovereignty to smuggle slavery into the territories, but slavery already exists in all territories by virtue of the federal constitution. The intervention in the existing rights of the free states is just as bold; it is declared "that a slave can be brought into a free state by his master without thereby gaining the right to claim his freedom in this free state;" according to which a slave owner may also continue to own his slaves in a free state. - According to these preliminary propositions, only a single conclusion would have been necessary to decree the legal existence of slavery in the free states, to declare all free people of colour to be slaves, and to reopen the African slave trade; however, the consequence was not drawn, - perhaps the federal court saved it for another occasion. Even so it was enough: slavery was declared to be a national institution, it was the rule, freedom only the tolerated exception; and all this was proved by the Federal Constitution, which the whole world had hitherto been accustomed to interpret in the opposite sense.

The North was justly outraged at this degradation of justice, the South triumphed, and President Buchanan, its obedient servant, recognized the new theorems. Of course, they were immediately applied to the disputed Kansas. Hitherto three "Northern men of Southern principles" had served as governor there (Reeder and Geary of Pennsylvania, Shannon of Ohio); they had all been converted to Republicanism by the force of facts; now Buchanan sent a Southerner, Walker of Mississippi, who was believed incapable of such weakness. In the meantime, before he arrived, the Lecompton legislature had taken a census, which was falsified beyond measure in favour of the slave-state party, and on the basis of this census a convention was elected which proposed a slave-state constitution in Lecompton; this Lecompton constitution was submitted to a public vote on June 15, 1857, and was adopted by about 2000 votes. The Free State party, persisting in its passive resistance, had not taken part in these elections and votes, and had openly declared its intention to adhere to its Topeca constitution. Now Walker came, at the end of June; one of his first measures was to mobilize soldiers against the Free Staters because they were conducting local elections, etc., on their own. However, he was an honourable man, and when he first became acquainted with the circumstances, he made no secret of his indignation; he maintained the existing Lecompton legislation, but he promised the Free-Statesmen to protect the purity of the elections if they would take part in the forthcoming new elections to the legislature. They were persuaded and did not regret it, for Walker kept his word; and so it happened that the Free State party, by 7600 votes to 3700, carried their congressional candidate and 39 deputies, the slaveholders only 13. They cried out

about electoral fraud and submitted petitions with forged signatures, but Walker exposed the new fraud and sanctioned the election result. The long-ruling, now defeated party tried one more thing; the Lecompton Convention met again and ordered another referendum on whether the Lecompton Constitution should apply with or without slavery. They wanted to save the appearance of giving the people free will, but they speculated on the usual neighbourly help from Missouri, which did not fail to materialize. Moreover, the clause was added that anyone whose right to vote was questioned should swear to support the constitution one way or another. Again, therefore, the Free-State men abstained from voting, - and thus the Lecompton Constitution with slavery was adopted by 6143 votes to 569, on December 21, 1857. Walker had protested against this whole proceeding, and had himself travelled to Washington to make his protest; he obtained there nothing but his removal. But the Free State party helped itself; the newly elected legislature quickly met and decided that, because the last vote had been a fraudulent one, the people should be consulted again; whereupon the Lecompton Constitution was rejected by 10,226 votes, on January 4, 1858. - However, the federal power took no heed of the repeated manifestations of the will of the people, and now endeavoured through Congress to thrust Kansas into the group of slave states; on February 2, Buchanan sent the Lecompton Constitution to Congress with a message stating that under the Dred Scott decision, Kansas was now as good a slave state as Georgia or South Carolina. In the Senate, the chief vanguard of Southern interests, a bill to this effect was passed without difficulty; but the House of Representatives twice rejected this bill, and desired at least to give the people of Kansas a second vote, which the Senate refused to do. A conference committee of both houses was formed, and from this emerged the so-called English Bill (named after W. H. English of Indiana), which was adopted by both houses after seven days of heated fighting, on April 30. It decreed: "The Lecompton Constitution should once again be submitted to the people for a vote; if it (i.e., slavery) were approved, Kansas should immediately be admitted as a state and 5 million acres of land should be transferred to it for railroad construction; but in the event of rejection, no donation of land would be made, and Kansas would not be exempted until it had reached the legal population for the election of one representative to Congress, 93,340 inhabitants." This was nothing but a base attempt to win over the people of Kansas, who could not be forced in any other way, by bribery for the plans of the southern aristocracy. But the latter proved the old glory, and on August 3, 1858, again rejected the Lecompton constitution. The next year a new constituent assembly met in Wyandot, July 1859, which proposed a free-state constitution with a ban on slavery; the same thing happened in the

territory of Nebraska; in both places, however, the Buchanan governors vetoed it. Only after the secession of the cotton states did both houses of Congress approve the admission of Kansas as a free state, January 28, 1861. Thus ended the tragedy in Kansas with the victory of the just cause! Just as this has been an example for the free North to pick itself up again and to resist further compromises with slavery, so the attitude of the people, which is beyond all praise, and even the honest change of heart of the governors, is a pleasing sight for the foreign observer in a time when arbitrary regimentation and corruption were the order of the day. And whoever in recent years, after over-praising, have been too harsh in their censure of the Americans, may look here and remember that dirt floats to the top.

Directly connected with the Kansas tragedy is an event that must be seen as a setback to the outrages practiced by the slaveholders. In the guerrilla warfare of both parties, John Brown, a native of Vermont, then in New York, had made an excellent reputation there: a man of the old stock of the iron Puritans of New England, and a fanatical abolitionist; surrounded by six sons of the same stamp, he had been a terror to the Missouri frontiersmen. Now, when the danger to the cause of freedom there had passed, he bitterly resolved to "carry the war to Africa," to attack slavery in their own homeland. Under a false name he rented a farm near Harpers Ferry on the Potomac, in Virginia, gathered a small band there and sought to make connections among the slaves; his plan was to take the neighbouring federal arsenal and then call his fellow abolitionists and the slaves themselves to arms. In October 1859 he took action: the arsenal was easily stormed, but the hoped-for influx and slave revolt failed to materialize; on the other hand, Virginian militia and federal troops immediately rushed in and, after a desperate resistance, captured the small remnant of the heroic crowd, including Brown, who was badly wounded. A wave of panic swept through all the slave states, and people did not calm down until the mortally wounded old man had died on the gallows like a martyr for a noble cause. - In the next session of Congress, December, 1859, the Southerners made an attempt to exploit this event in their interest; in the Senate they accused the most prominent members of the Republican party of "moral complicity" in Brown's crime and requested an investigating committee; contrary to their expectations, the Republican senators agreed, but demanded in mockery that Kansas thugs' storming of the armoury should also be investigated, against which the guilty conscience of the opponents resisted; - so the point was broken off.

As in Kansas, so in all other matters the Buchanan administration proved itself a compliant tool of the southern aristocracy, both at home and in foreign policy, which

supported the southern desire for aggrandizement. We would like to mention one point in particular. The cotton growers had long desired a resumption of the African slave trade, as they could obtain their supplies much more cheaply in this way than from the slave-breeding states, and if one draws the consequences from the Dred Scott decision, there was nothing legally standing in the way. But the prohibition of 1807 applied once, and it found a guardian not only in the Free States, but also in the slave breeders interested in it. The matter couldn't have been achieved with just one attempt. Buchanan contented himself with a gradual approach; with shameless publicity, slave traders were allowed to be equipped in the harbor of New York, and although the African return cargo mostly went to Cuba, occasionally one still made its way to the cotton-producing states. In order to make the shameful trade completely safe, Buchanan denied the English the last remnants of the right of search in 1857: their own surveillance squadron on the African coast was no obstacle; and so it seemed that the American flag was well on the way to gaining a comfortable monopoly of the African slave trade.

That under these circumstances the northern opposition party, the Republicans, grew ever stronger is natural, even in Congress. At the opening of the thirty-sixth, December 5, 1859, it was already stronger than the Democratic, but did not yet have an absolute majority, because between the two stood the last remnant of the Knownothings. Astonished foreigners at that time were treated to the spectacle that the presidential election in the House of Representatives lasted eight weeks; for the Republicans insisted on pushing through a candidate who was particularly objectionable to the South because he had publicly recommended an abolitionist book: but they were unable to do so because the Knownothings voted with the Democrats for so long; but as soon as they dropped this candidate, they succeeded in pushing through another at once, and the House was finally organized on February 1, 1860. Five weeks afterward, March 5, the same House appointed a Committee on Corruption to investigate the conduct of the President and the Administration; this was not a partisan prosecution, but the public voice, which raised ever louder and graver charges, that forced this measure. Corruption had certainly always existed since the phrase "To the victor the spoils!" was used; it had gradually increased; but it was only under Pierce that it became quite apparent, when two Democratic factions quarrelled loudly about the distribution; and under Buchanan, where it was necessary to hold together the completely depraved and increasingly fragmented party around the southern core, the measure overflowed. The investigation, against which the President remonstrated in vain, revealed a number of the most serious facts; but the House refrained from bringing formal

charges, since constitutionally the Senate has to pronounce judgment in state trials, where the President could still count on a safe majority. They were content with the moral result, which did not remain without influence on the election campaign of 1860.

In this presidential election the Republicans had the advantage from the outset, for they were the only firmly united organization, while everywhere else there was a breakaway. Of the Knownothings, the northern anti-slavery wing had already gone over to the Republicans in the election of 1856; the southern pro-slavery wing still had its own candidate (Fillmore) (against Buchanan and Fremont), but he only received the electoral votes of Maryland; nevertheless, these so-called "Southern Americans" had held together until 1860, but now the small remnant was completely crushed. - Instead, a momentary party formation arose, which threw itself like a cushion between the clash of the Republican North and the Democratic South; these were mostly old gentlemen, fanatics of peace and state salvation, who, without a real positive program, declared themselves only for the preservation of the status quo; They nominated Bell of Tennessee as their candidate and called themselves the Union Men; —naturally, they met with little approval.

As to the Democratic party, a schism had broken out in it since the year 1857-58, which was widening more and more. As already mentioned, by the Dred Scott decision slavery had been recognized as a national institution already existing in the territories by virtue of the Federal Constitution; the Buchanan administration and the Southern aristocracy had joyfully and unconditionally accepted this principle, and had all the more readily thrown overboard the Douglas principle of squatter sovereignty, since it had proved so bad for them in Kansas. But Douglas himself did not go along with the swing; he had to take some account of his Illinois constituency; moreover, he realized that if that ultra-theory were unconditionally enforced in the party, a complete defection of Northern adherents would follow. By a middle course, however, he believed he could keep the party together and secure for himself the leadership as well as the next presidency; and this middle course was: the Dred Scott decision should, of course, apply in principle, but the squatter sovereignty should practically stand above it. In the negotiations in Congress over the Lecompton Constitution, this opposition first emerged: the southern ultras (Lecompton Democrats) wanted to impose any constitution with slavery on the people of Kansas against their will; Douglas and his northern followers (anti-Lecompton Democrats) voted against the Constitution and wanted the will of the squatter sovereigns to be respected. The southern aristocracy never forgave Douglas

for this recalcitrance; they dropped him; only the northern wing of the party held on to him. Douglas now even acted as if he had done a favour for the free North with his popular sovereignty principle, because - contrary to his own original intention - it had practically saved Kansas from free labour! This saved and won over some northern supporters of Douglas's democracy; for a moment, the cunning politician could hope to draw the entire Republican Party over to his side, for there was indeed serious talk within the party of such a coalition, just to be on the safe side. But this prospect soon faded, and as the election campaign approached, another attempt was made to glue the two wings of democracy together. The joint convention at Charleston, April 23, 1860, which was attended by delegates from all the states, led, however, after wild debates, to a complete rupture; and the delegations of eight Southern states withdrew at once. The rump adjourned to Baltimore, where, after another division, Douglas was finally designated the candidate of the Northern Democracy: the Southern opposition, however, at a convention in Richmond, elected the present Vice-President of the Union, John Breckinridge of Kentucky, as their candidate. The two programs embodied the above-mentioned contrast, but without particular sharpness: in practice, a President Douglas would not have managed differently than a President Buchanan or Breckinridge.

As against the above three candidates, the Republican party, at the convention in Chicago, May 16-18, 1860, nominated as its own the advocate Abraham Lincoln of Illinois, born in Kentucky, February, 1809; the most distinguished leader and founder of the party, W. H. Seward of New-York, was, as is usual in American party life of recent times, set aside for reasons of expediency. The Republican program, as far as the burning question is concerned, condemns the continued administrative oppression of Kansas and Nebraska, the reopening of the African slave trade, no less the Douglas' principle of popular sovereignty "calculated to deceive", above all, the interpretation of the Federal Constitution in favour of slavery set forth in the Dred Scott decision, "which is in direct conflict with the express provisions of that document, with the declarations of contemporaries of the Revolution, and with previous judicial and legislative decisions." The main passage reads: "All the territory of the United States is by right a free territory ... We therefore deny to Congress, to any territorial government, or to whomsoever it may be, the power to sanction slavery in any territory of the United States." - One must praise both the firmness and the moderation. Not a word of attack against the "peculiar institution" of the Southern States; not even the slave-hunting law of 1850, so hated by the North, is challenged; but at the same time the earnest declaration that no further growth of

slave territories and slave States will be permitted; slavery is to be permanently restricted to the territory which it now holds. All federal territory that is still available is to be reserved for free labour; and two further paragraphs of the program serve to encourage this, as well as European immigration. The first condemns the xenophobic tendencies of the former Knownothings and guarantees the maintenance of the existing liberal naturalization laws; the second calls for the final enactment of the "homestead law," which has already been proposed several times in Congress, according to which every real settler, whether native-born or immigrant, is to be allocated 160 acres of land free of charge. At the same time, the best means have been chosen to increase the power of the free North and to further consolidate a natural superiority over the South.

November 6 was the decisive day. As is well known, the president is elected indirectly, each state appointing as many electors as it has representatives and senators in both houses of Congress; the total number of electoral votes amounted to 303. Of these, Lincoln received 180 (all from the Free States, except 3 New Jersey votes); for Breckinridge, 11 Southern States voted 72 votes; for Bell, the three States of Kentucky, Tenessee and Virginia, 39 votes; for Douglas, the State of Missouri, 9 votes, and 3 of the 7 New Jersey votes, together 12 votes. On the other hand, if one counts the primary votes, Douglas had the most after Lincoln, then Breckinridge and Bell. Thus, "it follows that after the Republican party, the Douglas party (anti-Lecompton Democracy) was the strongest; but it was widely dispersed throughout the Union and had the local majority in only one state; in the North the Republicans prevailed, in the South the Lecompton Democrats. The mediating parties (Bell and Douglas) were only able to make headway in the middle slave-breeding states, whose interests were primarily dependent on the continued existence of the Union. It should not go unmentioned that the German Americans were overwhelmingly on Lincoln's side.

Abraham Lincoln was thus elected President of the United States. His election meant that the previous supremacy of the southern aristocracy and the further spread of slavery was to come to an end; the free North now wanted to take over hegemony, as it was entitled to by right due to its superiority in numbers, wealth and intelligence. The southern aristocracy did not want to submit to this pronouncement of the majority and planted the flag of secession.

We conclude by reserving the right to return to the further course of the separation and the struggle in a later article. Enough, for the present, to convince

ourselves how the present clash was an inevitable one, or, in Seward's words, an "irrepressible conflict!" The Southern aristocracy, having once obtained supremacy, had, in order to maintain it, to encroach farther and farther; it had to strive to convert the whole Union into a territory of slavery. When at last the North has risen against it and espoused the cause of free labor, when a great Bell shakes off the yoke of an aristocratic caste, then it cannot reasonably be doubted on which side the sympathies of civilized Europe should be